



Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

BT 10 .C87 v.6

Current discussions in
theology

Shelf

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY.

— BY —

THE PROFESSORS

— OF —

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

VOLUME VI.

BOSTON AND CHICAGO:
CONGREGATIONAL SUNDAY-SCHOOL AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY.

COPYRIGHT, 1889.

BY CONGREGATIONAL SUNDAY-SCHOOL AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY.

PREFACE.

The aim of these *DISCUSSIONS* is to answer the question, which every earnest student of theology and ecclesiastical subjects may well be supposed to ask at the end of each year, viz.: What has been done in the different fields of sacred learning during the past twelve months, and what are the latest results of such studies?

In preparing this Report of Progress, critical reference has been made to the most recent literature, as a help to those who wish to prosecute their studies further along the lines indicated, while enough of the fruits of the latest investigation is given to make the work immediately profitable to the student.

In summing up the labors of theologians and critics, the natural drift of the literature leads the reviewer, in most departments, to dwell upon works that deviate somewhat from the beaten path, and in such writings to notice principally what is new and claims to be better than what we already know; for any adequate account of generally accepted views is precluded by the limits of the work and by the supposition that they are already familiar to the reader. Such considerations, and not any particular sympathy with theological novelties, explain the complexion of these *DISCUSSIONS*, which may appear to some as giving undue prominence to radical teachings and criticisms. Such considerations account, also, for the

PREFACE.

many references to works of foreign origin, especially German, which appear in these pages; if, in some departments, Anglo-Saxon writers are in the minority, the simple reason is that they produce a much smaller number of books, and naturally less that is new, than do foreign authors.

Several leading publishers have already shown their readiness to send new works to us for notice in our Annual Review; we would call the attention of others to this matter and request their coöperation. We should be gratified, also, to receive from authors copies of their writings, especially of monographs or other essays, which cannot be easily obtained through the regular channels.

This Volume of our work, though it appears within a year after the publication of Vol. V., has still been delayed somewhat by the unavoidable pressure of other duties. In general, it reports research to the early Autumn of 1888, in a few cases the literary notices extending into 1889.

THE FACULTY.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

CHICAGO, MARCH 31, 1889.

C O N T E N T S.

PART FIRST—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

I. OLD TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE OF OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	3-4
CHAPTER I.	
THE HEBREW LANGUAGE AND HEBREW GRAMMAR	5-9
CHAPTER II.	
TEXTUAL CRITICISM	10-12
CHAPTER III.	
OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION	13-29
Genesis	15-16
The Pentateuch	16-20
Deuteronomy	20-23
Psalms	23-24
Chokma Literature	24-26
Song of Songs	26-29
CHAPTER IV.	
Histories of Israel	30-40
Monographs	40-46
Geography	46-52
Archaeology	52-55
CHAPTER V.	
OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS	56-71
Genesis	57-61
Psalms	61-69
Isaiah	70-71
Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther	71
CHAPTER VI.	
OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY	72-75

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY—CONCLUDED.

II. NEW TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE OF NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES.

CHAPTER I.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION	79-93
Adrian's Introduction	79-80
The Synoptists	81-83
John's Gospel	83-84
The Acts	84-85
The Letters of Paul	86-89
The Catholic Epistles and Hebrews	89-92
The Apocalypse	92-93

CHAPTER II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT	94-96
----------------------------------	-------

CHAPTER III.

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY	97-101
---------------------------------	--------

CHAPTER IV.

NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS	102-131
The Gospels	102-112
The Acts	112-113
Paul's Epistles	113-128
Epistles of Peter	128-129
Epistle to the Hebrews	129-130
The Apocalypse	130-131

CHAPTER V.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY	132-145
----------------------------------	---------

PART SECOND—HISTORIC THEOLOGY.

PRESENT STATE OF STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

INTRODUCTION, HISTORIC METHODS AND ORIGIN OF THE EARLY CHURCH	149-156
CHAPTER I.	
THE EARLY CHURCH	157-205
I. Relation of Church and Empire	157-166
II. History of Doctrine	166-183
III. Organization of the Early Church	183-191
IV. Christian Life—Monasticism	191-196
V. Christian Worship	196-199
VI. Art in the Early Church	199-205
CHAPTER II.	
THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES	206-233
I. History of the Papacy	206-213
II. The Catholic Church of Scotland	213-217
III. History of Doctrine and Sects	217-220
IV. Monastic Orders	221-227
V. Movements leading towards the Reformation .	227-233
CHAPTER III.	
THE MODERN CHURCH	234-276
I. The Reformation	234-246
II. The Huguenots	247-248
III. Church Life in Holland	249-252
IV. The Roman Catholic Church	252-256
V. Recent Theological Discussions in Germany .	257-269
VI. The Churches of Great Britain	269-272
VII. The American Churches	272-276

PART THIRD—SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

PRESENT STATE OF STUDIES IN NATURAL AND REVEALED THEOLOGY.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	279-283
I. TREATISES ON THEOLOGY AS A SYSTEM	284-311
Dogmatik, Böhl	284-286
Dogmatic Theology, Shedd	287-295
Theology of Ritschl	295-297
Principles of Christianity, Stuart	297-305
Non-Biblical Systems of Religion	305-307
Rational Theology, Williams	307-309
Christian Belief, Ziegler	309-311
II. TREATISES ON SPECIFIC DOCTRINES	311-351
1. Apologetics	311-327
2. Inspiration	327-330
3. Christology and the Trinity	331-336
4. The Atonement	336-344
5. Eschatology	344-346
6. Church Polity	347-351
III. ETHICS	351-360
Freedom of the Will, Meyer	351-352
Hegel's Philosophy of the State and of History, Morris	352-355
Fairbairn's Doctrine of Morality	355-357
Philosophy and Religion, Strong	357-358
Study of Philosophy, Stuckenbergs	358-360

PART FOURTH—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

I. PRESENT STATE OF STUDIES IN HOMILETICS.

CHAPTER I.

THEORETICAL HOMILETICS—PREACHING.

The German Pulpit, Stuckenborg	364-366
The Scottish Pulpit, Taylor	366-370
English in the Pulpit, Hill	370-372
Story Telling in the Pulpit, Hale	372-375
The Value of Historical Studies to the Pulpit, Murray .	375-376
The Men, the Training and the Preparation for the Pulpit, Ormiston	376-382
Woman in the Pulpit, Willard	383-387
The Pulpit and Modern Skepticism, several authors .	387-398
Yale Lectures on Preaching and other Writings, Burton	398-404
The Vocation of the Preacher, Hood	404-407
John Ward, Preacher, Deland	407-408
Evangelistic Work, Pierson	409-412
Modern Cities and their Religious Problems, Loomis .	412-413

CHAPTER II.

PRACTICAL HOMILETICS—SERMONS.

Eternal Atonement, Hitchcock	414-416
Fifteen years in the Chapel of Yale College, Porter .	416-419
Gospel Sermons, McCosh	419-422
Expositions, Cox	422-423
Sermons preached in St. George's, Rainsford . .	423-425
Sermons for Children, Ross	425-426
Spirit and Life, Bradford	427-428
The Victory of the Cross, Westcott	429-433
The World to Come, Wright	433-435

II. PRESENT STATE OF STUDIES IN PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

The Churches and the Workingmen, Abbott	439-440
Legal Rights and Responsibilities of Clergymen, Hull	441-443
The Problem of the Country Church, Tunis	443-447
Yale Lectures on the Sunday School, Trumbull	447-451
Terms of Christian Union	451-457
Christian Beneficence	457-458
The Weekly Offering	458-459
Free Seats in Churches, Pierson	459-462
Deaconesses in Europe, Mead	462-463
Shall Women Preach? Willard	463-466

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

OLD TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE
OF
OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES.
BY
REV. SAMUEL IVES CURTISS,

PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

There probably never was a time in the history of theological study in America, when such an interest was taken in Old Testament investigations, as in recent years. There has been a wonderful advance, as has been intimated before, in the study of Hebrew. The attainments of the average American theological student in this language have been painfully meagre, and are still entirely inadequate. It is, therefore, of special interest to us, as well as to German theologians, to have the fact brought before us that during the first years of this century, until 1817, Hebrew occupied an honorable place in the commencement exercises of Harvard College. Professor Moore of Andover is giving an interesting survey of Old Testament studies in America from the very beginning, in Stade's *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.¹ He tells us that there was a time in the history of Harvard and Yale colleges, during the eighteenth century, when Hebrew was made a part of the literary course. In this respect these institutions resembled the German Gymnasia. But such studies, lacking the impulse in any scientific investigation of the text, fell into disuse. We may suppose that they are now put on a settled basis, for exegesis has become a scientific study as never before. Those who may seem to some to

¹ Giessen, 1888, pp. 1-42.

be over-turning the foundations of our faith through these critical studies really subserve an important end in promoting Biblical researches. The love which men have for God's Word leads them to explore the mysteries of its language, history, and archaeology.

CHAPTER I.

THE HEBREW LANGUAGE AND HEBREW GRAMMAR.

One of the greatest needs of modern Old Testament scholars is that some one should prepare a history of the Hebrew language. This was admirably done by Gesenius¹ in the early part of the present century, but a new work should now be provided by some competent man.

Meanwhile, we are grateful for Baumgartner's *Introduction to the Study of the Hebrew Language*,² which, as the author says, is not designed for specialists, but for beginners. He considers that it ought to be the prolegomena to the Hebrew grammar of Strack, which he has translated into French.

He seeks to afford the student of the Hebrew language the information most needed regarding the relative position which the Hebrew occupies among the other Semitic languages, and the development which this language has undergone during its different literary periods.

The term Semitic, which was invented by Schlözer, and first introduced by Eichhorn, is inexact. The Elamites, who were the descendants of Shem, did not speak a Semitic language, while the Phoenicians and Arabians, who spoke Semitic dialects, were regarded as descendants of Ham.

¹ *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift.* Leipzig, 1815.

² *Introduction à l'Étude de la Langue Hébraïque,* Paris.

America has had an honorable record in the production of Hebrew grammars. Stuart, Nordheimer¹ and Green have secured a prominent place among those who have devoted themselves to grammatical studies. They have not been excelled by any English scholars who have sought to prepare works on Hebrew grammar. It is only in Germany, where men are content with small incomes, and where university education sets a premium on scientific training, that two luminaries of a higher order have appeared in the persons of Gesenius and Ewald. Professor Green, whose grammar has been known twenty-seven years, has made a valuable contribution to Hebrew learning in the production of a new edition.² The treatment remains essentially the same, although the syntax has been enlarged from forty-seven pages to one hundred and twenty-seven. The grammar was originally based on careful and exhaustive treatises, both ancient and modern. Professor Green's conservatism has led him to retain the unfortunate terminology, as we think, of future and preterite, which, as we have shown elsewhere,³ has been rejected by almost all Semitic scholars of any eminence, because in the Semitic languages the verb does not indicate distinctions of time, but rather of action as complete or incomplete.

The work by Professor Harper, which he modestly entitles, *Elements of Hebrew Syntax*,⁴ is constructed, like his

¹ *A critical Grammar of the Hebrew Language*. Vols. i-ii. New York, 1838-1841.

² *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language*. New York, 1888.

³ *Current Discussions in Theology* Boston and Chicago. Vol. v, 1888, pp. 3-4.

⁴ New York, 1888.

other works, on the inductive method. A large number of examples are gathered together, and the principles are deduced from them, so that the student can see how certain results are derived from given processes.

As the product of one of the most successful teachers in Hebrew, it will be gladly welcomed by all who are employing the inductive method in the instruction of their students.

One of the most important sections in Hebrew grammar is that regarding nominal sentences. A noun represents an idea in a state of rest, a verb represents it in a state of motion. Albrecht has contributed an important investigation on the "nominal sentence." While the distinction between nominal and verbal sentences has recently been introduced from the Arabic grammars, it has been demonstrated that it is not an artificial one. According to his definition, "the nominal sentence gives to the subject an abiding attribute or condition."¹ It is essential to a nominal sentence that it should have an independent subject, either a noun or a pronoun, and that the predicate should be either a substantive, an adjective, a participle, an adverbial or prepositional expression. Albrecht illustrates these cases by a multitude of classified citations from the Old Testament.²

Dr. Wickes has produced a treatise of epoch-making significance on the *Accentuation of the twenty-one so called prose books of the Old Testament*.³ Familiarizing himself

¹ The first article is translated in *Hbraica*, New York, 1888, pp. 95-98.

² *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1888, pp. 249-263.

³ Oxford, 1887.

OLD TESTAMENT EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

with all that has been written on the subject, he has devoted about fifteen years to this difficult theme, learning all that he could from the eminent Jewish scholar, Baer, and then pushing his investigations through the use of the best Hebrew manuscripts far beyond those of any other scholar. He has found it necessary to propose a correction of the Massoretic *textus receptus*. He has, however, proved to be an iconoclast. The two most famous recensions of the Massoretic text are found in the manuscripts of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali. Their readings have been handed down by tradition. It is claimed that the codex of Ben Asher is preserved in a Jewish synagogue at Aleppo. Graetz, Sapphir, and Strack have maintained the genuineness of this codex, but Wickes seems to have proved conclusively that the epigraph, assigning it to Ben Asher, is a fabrication. Dr. Wickes is worthy of all recognition for this valuable monograph.

Little attention has been given to the subject of Hebrew poetry, until recent years, since the time of the classic works by Lowth and Herder. Not to mention Bickell's treatise on this subject, which was issued some years ago, Ley has prepared a work on Hebrew metrical poetry together with the text of the first book of Psalms.¹ It is founded on a much larger book, published in 1875. He considers the metre very important for text criticism, and claims that the Massoretic division of the text into verses must be changed in many places when it is contrary to the sense, the parallelism, and consequently to the metre, since all three stand in the most intimate organic connec-

¹ *Leitfaden der Metrik der Hebräischen Poesie nebst dem ersten Buche der Psalmen.* Halle a. S. 1887.

tion. Professor Briggs has given a practical discussion of this subject in *Hebraica*.¹ He finds examples of tetrameters, trimeters, pentameters, and even hexameters in Hebrew poetry, but he finds more examples of trimeters and pentameters than of any other kind of metre, though he says the greater portion of Hebrew poetry is the trimeter movement.

1 *The Hebrew Tetrameter*, New York, 1888, pp. 65-74; *The Hebrew Pentameter*, *Ibid.* pp. 129-139; *The Hebrew Hexameter*, *Ibid.* pp. 201-205.

CHAPTER II.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

New Testament scholars have made wonderful progress, in the present century, toward determining what was the original text of the New Testament writings. The question of the primitive text of the Old Testament, as has been intimated before,¹ constitutes a far more difficult problem. The text that has been handed down to us by the Massoretes with such scrupulous exactness was not based on a critical text. The Talmudists knew nothing about criticism. So far as we can learn, three manuscripts were chosen and the agreement of two against one on a certain reading was considered decisive.² As ancient Hebrew manuscripts were not valued, but rather became unclean through age, and there was no inducement for their preservation as an authoritative text, they have perished. There is not much chance, therefore, for text criticism in the Old Testament, except as we can reproduce the Hebrew text, which underlies the ancient versions. By a cautious translation of the Alexandrian version back into Hebrew we may be able to reproduce, with some degree of certainty, the ancient Hebrew text from which it was derived.

¹ *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1885, Vol. iii., pp. 18-27.

² Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Göttingen, 1823, pp. 347-348.

Until the text of the Septuagint shall be fixed through the reproduction and critical combination of the texts of Hesychius, Lucian, Pamphilus and Eusebius the apparatus for revising the Massoretic text through the use of the Alexandrian must necessarily be imperfect.

The best that can now be done, before the labors of such scholars as Lagarde are complete, is to secure as correct a text as possible on the basis of the great uncial manuscripts.

Even this is not entirely possible, because the exact readings of the great Vatican manuscript have not been accessible to the learned world by reason of the partial incompetence, at least, of those who have sought to present a facsimile¹ copy of it, and the seemingly illiberal policy of the curators of the Vatican library, who have not permitted even the most distinguished scholars to make any considerable use of it. The Syndics of the Cambridge University Press were so impressed with the importance of the critical edition of the Septuagint, that they appointed a committee to secure the preparation of such a text based on that found in the Vatican manuscript.² The work is edited by Dr. Swete. Where the Vatican manuscript is wanting, the deficiency is supplied from the Alexandrian manuscript, and, where both of these fail, "from the uncial manuscript, which occupies the next place in point of age and importance." It is proposed to issue a larger work which will be provided with Prolegomena, but

¹ Cf. Nestle in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig, 1882, cols. 119-124.

² *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Vol. i, Genesis to iv Kings. Cambridge, 1887.

many years will be required for its preparation. At present, however, this volume, which contains the text from Genesis to IV Kings, seems to be best adapted to the wants of ordinary students.

The Syriae text as found in the Peshitto, although the most ancient of the Aramaic versions, at least in its written form, has not received any such attention as that of the Septuagint, nor does it promise any such rewards to the critic. It was not prepared until after the Hebrew text had taken on a fixed form as some modern critics claim through the labors of Rabbi Akiba.¹

A Jewish scholar, Dr. Seboek, has compared the readings of the Peshitto with those of the Massoretic text in the Twelve Minor Prophets.² In general he considers that this version was prepared by a Jewish Christian from the Hebrew original. He finds many points of contact with the common Jewish Targums, in the Pentateuch, the Prophets and the Hagiographa. He does not find that there is any radical difference between the readings of this version and those of the Massoretic text. Even in the interpretation of difficult passages the Syriac translator has failed to give us any light.

¹ *Current Discussions in Theology.* Chicago, 1885, Vol. iii, p. 21.

² *Die syrische Uebersetzung der zwölf kleinen Propheten und ihr Verhältniss zu dem massoretischen Text und zu den älteren Uebersetzungen, namentlich den LXX. und dem Targum.* Breslau, 1887.

CHAPTER III.

OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.

Critical questions regarding the composition of the Pentateuch and the age of its various documents still continue to occupy the attention of specialists. Of works designed to cover the entire subject only three have appeared during the past year. The first is the eighth edition of Weber's *Short Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testament*,¹ designed especially for students in the German Gymnasia. It does not enter into the discussion of critical questions to any extent, and is clearly conservative.

Martin,² who is already known by his contribution to the criticism of the New Testament, is issuing a voluminous work on the Old. His standpoint is pre-determined by his ecclesiastical connection as a Roman Catholic. The two volumes, which have already appeared, betray a pretty accurate acquaintance with the theories of the critics, chiefly through the medium of the English and French languages. He firmly holds the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, but says in the introduction: "I willingly

¹ *Kurzgefasste Einleitung in die heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testamente*. Nördlingen, 1887.

² *Introduction à la Critique Générale de l'Ancien Testament, de l'origine du Pentateuque*, Tom. i-ii, Paris, 1887-1888.

admit that the Pentateuch has been subjected to numerous alterations in detail, and that it has been the object of much re-touching; but I deny that it has been the product of that gradual and successive elaboration, which modern authors describe. . . . I refuse to allow one point in particular to pass, that Deuteronomy is anterior to the preceding books of the Pentateuch, taken as a whole, and that it should not be the work of a single spirit and of a single writer. The unity of plan is such, the connection of parts is so profound, and so minute, that it is impossible, as it seems to me, that a single intelligence should not at once have conceived and executed the plan of this book."¹

Revel, recently deceased, late a professor of the Waldensian Institute at Florence, treats the subject under the title of *Hebrew Literature*.² in a dainty little hand-book in two volumes. With admirable clearness and conciseness he discusses the origin of the Hebrew people, Hebraism and Judaism; the Hebrew language and literature; historiography; lyric and gnomic poetry; the prophets of the Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian periods; and finally, the legislation: the Decalogue, the First Code, Deuteronomy, the Code of Ezekiel, and the Sacerdotal Code. This work is based on a partial knowledge of English, French and German Old Testament literature, but does not add anything to our information regarding the subject.

Some of the most valuable discussions bearing on introduction are found in the commentaries as well as in other works on the Old Testament.

¹ *Ibid.* pp. viii, ix.

² *Letteratura Ebraica*, Milano, 1888.

GENESIS.—Professor Delitzsch has issued a new edition of his *Commentary on Genesis*.¹ The fourth edition appeared in 1872. This has been so thoroughly revised that he calls it a new Commentary. It is now made accessible to English readers by means of a translation.²

It is of especial importance, as it gives Delitzsch's views regarding the origin of the Pentateuch in a connected form. Delitzsch has never been a destructive critic. He has never wavered in his sympathies with the conservative school. He has been interested in encouraging investigations, which he hoped would be favorable to a conservative position with reference to the origin of the Pentateuch. He has gradually felt compelled in the interests of truth, as he says, to accept the views of the modern critical school with reference to the origin and succession of the documents, although with important modifications, and with entirely different conclusions.

He holds firmly, that the Israelites were in Egypt, the university of ancient culture, that they were possessed of the art of writing at the time of the exodus, that Moses left certain memorials that have been incorporated in the Pentateuch, and that the Deuteronomico-Jehovistic style found in the Ten Commandments is that of Moses. He considers that, while the Priests' Code received its present form after the exile, at least some of its enactments are presupposed by the book of Deuteronomy. Indeed he sees a close connection between regulations regarding leprosy and purifications and the residence in Egypt. He does not consider that there was any design on the part of

¹ *Neuer Kommentar über die Genesis*. Leipzig, 1887.

² *A New Commentary on Genesis*. Vol i, New York, 1889.

Christ and New Testament writers to bear witness as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. When they speak of Moses, as if he were the author of the Pentateuch, they merely give expression to the common belief of their contemporaries, which certainly had a foundation in the mediatorship of the Law through Moses. They simply use popular instead of scientific language regarding the Pentateuch, as we to-day speak of Gesenius' Hebrew grammar, although, ever since 1842, it has been re-edited several times by two generations of scholars, as represented by Roediger and Kautzsch. In a popular sense it is still spoken of as Gesenius' Grammar, although in an exact scientific sense great changes and additions have been made by the editors.

Twelve of our American scholars, under the leadership of Dr. Chambers, have sought to raise a bulwark in defense of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The work consists of a little volume of twelve essays,¹ which furnishes a valuable statement of the subject for those who have not time for more extended examination of it, and who wish to approach it from a strictly conservative standpoint.

Dr. Chambers gives a brief sketch of the course of criticism, drawn from various sources. Professor Gardiner shows that the religion of Israel was a revelation and not merely a human development. We must believe, however, that it was a progressive revelation conditioned by human development, and that it tolerated certain views, which the fuller revelation in the New Testament shows to have been

¹ *Essays on Pentateuchal Criticism*, by various writers. New York, 1887, 1888.

temporary or even erroneous, as, for instance, the representations of Old Testament writers regarding the state of the dead in Sheol.

Professor Bissell treats of the Codes. He says, "No one claims that Moses actually penned the whole Pentateuch. Under his general direction a number of hands may have been, and in all probability were employed on it." But he thinks that all divergencies, which can be proved to exist in the Code, may have arisen during the time that Israel were in the wilderness.

Professor Green subjects the analysis of the first eleven chapters of Exodus to a searching criticism, and concludes, as the result of his investigation, that the division of these chapters into three documents by the critics is not justified. He thinks, however, that it would not be prejudicial to the doctrine of inspiration to admit the composite character of Genesis.

Professor Schodde in his essay on *Pentateuchal Testimony* makes greater concessions than either of the other essayists. He says: "The Pentateuch may have been Mosaic, and yet Moses need not, *sua manu*, have written a single word in it, nor the Pentateuch in its present shape date from him." He further affirms: "We do not... think that we have any direct testimony of the Pentateuch to prove that Moses himself wrote or caused to be written the whole of the five books;" and in another place: "There yet remain in the pages of the Pentateuch sufficient evidences, philological and material to make it probable that, as at present shaped, the five books are a compilation from a number of sources." Nevertheless, he says "these books claim in essence and substance to be Mosaic."

Professor Beecher takes up the *Testimony of the Historical Books, save Chronicles*, and finds it on the whole favorable to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He argues that Ezra and Nehemiah use a language which is clearly late Hebrew, while that employed in the Hexateuch is ancient Hebrew. If, then, the Hexateuch was written and edited during the generations in which the books of Ezra and Nehemiah were produced, he claims that it ought to exhibit the peculiarities of language that appear in these books.

The testimony of Chronicles in regard to the authorship of the Pentateuch is commonly thrown out by the critics of the modern school, because the writer is thought to present the history of Israel almost entirely from a subjective standpoint. But, as Professor Terry shows, there is no writer who quotes so many authorities, seventeen documents in all. There is no question, that it is the intention of the Chronicler to give a truthful account of the course of Israelitish history. But it may be a question, whether in the sources which are connected with the names of David and Solomon he finds references to that exact observance of the Levitical ritual which he so fully describes. The critics claim that his entire narrative has been colored by the condition of worship at the time in which he lived; hence that his testimony as to the authorship of the Pentateuch, and to the antiquity of the ritualistic observance, described in the middle books of the Pentateuch, is of doubtful value.

It is very difficult to find clear and satisfactory testimony in the most ancient prophets, to the existence of the Priests' Code at the time when they wrote. It is easy

enough to see that Jeremiah was familiar with Deuteronomy, and that there is a close connection between Ezekiel and Leviticus. Now, while there may be special reasons for the neglect of the older prophets to quote fully and freely from the Priests' Code, the fact that their references to the Code are few and uncertain removes an important support in the argument for the antiquity of the laws of the Priests' Code in their written form.

While the Psalms may be quoted, yet decisive proof in respect to their age, which we must consider independently of their superscriptions, renders this line of argument of uncertain value.

Such testimony, however, has been gathered by Professor Harmon, but not with sufficient discrimination. It is not enough to prove that there are references in the prophets to the Pentateuch as a whole, but it must be proved that there are explicit references to the Priests' Code alone. These, as has been intimated, are difficult to establish.

It is easy to point out the dangers of criticism, but the question as to the authorship of the Pentateuch must be determined, as we have remarked in previous volumes, not on dogmatic grounds, but on literary principles. It seems to us that the essay by Professor Dwinell on *Higher Criticism and a Spurious Bible* is too dogmatic. The following arraignment of the critical theory is made by Professor Streibert in his essay on *The Difficulties of the New Hypothesis*: “A theory which . . . would make the Pentateuch largely a tissue of fictions and perversions of history, deny the credibility or trustworthiness of every statement in the books of Samuel and Kings, which does not fall in with it, and call Chronicles a string of inventions

not worthy a serious examination—a theory which for the sake of consistency must deny not only all laws and history to Moses, but also all Psalms to David and all Proverbs to Solomon—such a theory seems to us not only to offer no satisfactory solution of the problem of the Pentateuch, but to make many more difficulties than are removed.”

The evidences are abundant that Christ and the Apostles, as well as Philo and Josephus, considered Moses the author of the Pentateuch. These testimonies are gathered by Dr. Hemphill in his essay on the *Validity and Bearing of the Testimony of Christ and His Apostles*. If we accept such testimony as inspired teaching regarding the authorship of these books, there is no room to discuss the question further with regard to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. But many like Professor Delitzsch hold that Christ and His Apostles merely present the popular view of their time, without intending to give any definite teaching in regard to this subject.

The most interesting confirmation of the antiquity of the Pentateuch, at least so far as the origin of some of its laws are concerned and the early date of the art of writing among the Hebrews, is found in the Essay by Professor Osgood on *A Reasonable Hypothesis of the Origin of the Pentateuch*. He concludes, “that historical criticism on the broadest lines, guided by the numerous monuments as interpreted by the most able investigators of the present day, must place the composition of the Pentateuch contemporaneous with events of the last four books, and must ascribe its composition to one master hand.”

DEUTERONOMY.—As is well known it is considered among critics that Deuteronomy arose either during the

time of Manasseh or Josiah, and that it was first brought to light in the year 621 B. C. This theory has been considered firmly established.

Recently Horst, who has written a book in regard to the authorship of Leviticus¹ xvii–xxvi, has set forth a new theory in regard to the origin of Deuteronomy. It has been almost unanimously held by critics that the book is a unity, and that if it has not been written by one author, it has at least been conceived in one spirit.

Horst² holds that the book is made up of fragments, and seems to maintain that it was not composed in its present form until after the Babylonian exile. He does not believe that 2 Kings, xxii–xxiii, furnish any certain data for the age of Deuteronomy. He speaks of this account as a dramatic fiction, which was written after the exile, and considers the prophetess Huldah a fictitious person. It will thus be seen that Horst belongs to the school of destructive critics, and that in regard to Deuteronomy he is an adherent of the fragmentary hypothesis.

Kittel, in his history of the Hebrews, which we shall notice later on, occupies a far more conservative position with reference to the origin of Deuteronomy. He says, “the process of its composition may be represented more simply in the following manner: A prophetic man, a true follower of Yahweh, wrote the book under Manasseh, induced through Hezekiah’s attempt at reform, and Manasseh’s idolatry. On account of the stress of the time, and

¹ *Leviticus xvii–xxvi und Hezekiel, Ein Beitrag zur Pentateuchkritik*, Colmar, 1881.

² *Études sur le Deutéronome* in the *Revue de l’histoire des Religions*, Paris, 1887, pp. 28–65; Paris, 1888, pp. 1–22.

the inimical disposition of the king, he did not dare to publish it. He did not wish to imperil himself and the working of his book. Hoping for better times, he hid it in the temple. Perhaps the author did not survive the long reign of Manasseh, otherwise, soon after the coronation of Josiah, he probably would soon have stepped into publicity. It seems, therefore, to have been forgotten, and first to have been found through a happy accident in the eighteenth year of Josiah.

"All disingenuousness is thus removed from Hilkiah and Shaphan. But this reproach, often made, cannot really touch the author of Deuteronomy. He was conscious of presenting Mosaic thoughts, and Mosaic law only in a new dress and with a new application to his people. Furthermore, this prophetic man undoubtedly knew that he was called to a special mission, and had received a revelation from God, when he freshly emphasized the "old" Mosaic law, and transformed much that had originated from Moses or in his spirit, and which had been added under his name in the course of time, according to the needs of a much advanced and in many respects corrupt age. Have we to-day, who with our modern conceptions can transport ourselves only with difficulty and inadequately into the spiritual life of that ancient time, a right to censure a man who so unmistakeably bears the stamp of a divinely inspired prophet? Have we a right to reproach him with pious or impious fraud, and to doubt his divine commission by means of which he raises before a generation sunk in idolatry and the false service of Yahweh the heroic form of the theocratic law-giver, and by means of his words and spirit presents to the new period

a new and at the same time old Mosaic law? Moses, if he had foreseen the age in which the author lived, could not have spoken otherwise than as he causes him to speak. He therefore summons Moses himself in prophetic investiture to speak to the past generation but with a view to a remote future. But the investiture through a half-poetic character has been designedly made almost transparent, so that we can perceive the true state of the case."¹

This is certainly the most satisfactory application of the modern critical theory with reference to the origin of Deuteronomy, which has yet appeared from the hands of a conservative scholar, and if we felt compelled to give up the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, we might well feel constrained to adopt the theory of Kittel as the least objectionable statement regarding the subject.

It certainly is not necessary, in any case, and is not consistent with the historical account of the origin of the Old Testament books, that we should suppose Deuteronomy is merely a pious fraud prepared as a programme by devout priests and prophets to secure certain reforms, and that this book was deliberately hid away in order that it might be found.

PSALMS.—A learned monograph on Psalm 68 (pp. 1-159) has been written by Dr. J. W. Pont, a Dutch scholar. The work was first prepared as a prize essay, and was duly recognized by the theological faculty of Utrecht, in 1885. The purpose of the treatise in its present form, was to secure the degree of Doctor of Divinity from the University of Amsterdam. After an introduction, he treats in

¹ *Geschichte der H̄bräer*, Gotha, 1888, pp. 58-59.

the first part of the criticism and exegesis of the Psalm, of the text and of its division. The second part is devoted to the discussion of the time when it was written.¹ He comes to the conclusion that it must have been composed after the captivity, in the time when the Ptolemies were in conflict with the Seleucidæ in regard to the possession of Palestine.

He says that the author is unknown, that perhaps he was a scribe who had buried himself in the study of Israel's prophets, and who observed the tremendous contrast between the prophetic ideal and the actual state of things in his own time.¹

THE CHOKMA LITERATURE.—Many valuable contributions to scientific theology are made by young men who are seeking degrees from German universities. Treatises hardly less valuable and sometimes much more elaborate are produced by young Swiss theologians who seek similar honors.

Henri Bois, son of a professor of the same name of the Faculty of Protestant Theology of Montauban, has produced a valuable work on *Gnomic Poetry among the Hebrews and the Greeks*.²

Bois makes the following distinction between lyric and

¹Psalm lxxviii. Eene Exegetisch-Kritische Studie. Academisch Proefschrift der verkrijging van den Graad van Doctor in de Godgeleerdheid, aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam . . . in het openbaar te verdedigen . . . door Johannes Wilhelm Pont, Leiden, 1887.

²La Poésie Gnominque chez les Hebreux et chez les Grecs Salomon et Théognis. Thèse publiquement soutenue devant la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de Montauban par Henri Bois de Montauban Bachelier es Sciences, Licencié es Lettres aspirant au Grade de Bachelier en Théologie, Toulouse, 1886.

gnomic poetry : “Lyric poetry is an inspiration, a kind of enthusiasm ; gnomic poetry is a work of art and reflection. The lyric author puts all his soul into his songs. The gnomic author gives expression to his thought in his verses . . . The first triumphs, mourns, or praises ; the second instructs, amuses, or pleases.”¹

He says : “Neither the rhyme, nor the measure of the syllables distinguishes gnomic poetry from prose, but the parallelism.”² He maintains that in the course of the ninth or eighth century B. C., a wise man gathered the chief maxims attributed to Solomon and joined to them later two appendices containing the maxims of unknown sages.³

The book of Proverbs in his view is eminently practical, and transports us to realms far removed from philosophy.⁴

He finds a flagrant antinomy in this book, which the authors do not suspect. “The liberty of man is everywhere pre-supposed in Proverbs. He is always considered able to form projects and to execute them . . . but, on the other hand, absolute fore-ordination by God is very clearly affirmed.”⁵

He says, wisdom is knowledge and employs many ways for arriving at the end proposed. There are two points of view, theoretical and practical.⁶ The end of wisdom indicated by the Hebrew sages is happiness. It comprehends first and foremost the elements of the ancient doctrine of rewards . . . such as a long life, a numerous and happy posterity. It always embraces riches, of which Proverbs make a great deal, and usually celebrates their advantages.⁷

¹ *Ibid.* p. 9.

² *Ibid.* p. 14.

³ *Ibid.* p. 40.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 43.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 53.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 59.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 65.

The idea of wisdom (*chokma*) is joined with a second idea of Proverbs, that of chastisement (*musar*), discipline¹ . . . the discipline exercised by God seems to contain the same elements as the discipline exercised by parents upon their children.²

He concludes that the result of his investigations is to "show that wisdom and discipline are essentially one."

THE SONG OF SONGS has received much attention from modern critics. Two works have appeared within the past year, one by Stickel,³ the other by Daland.⁴ Stickel presents the following views in regard to the book: 1. "Only the sense of the words as indicated by the idiom, and the connection, is to be regarded. Since there is not the slightest indication that it is to be understood in any other way than according to the literal sense, every figurative interpretation is to be disregarded, whether allegorical, or mystico-spiritual, or typico-messianic, or historico-political. 2. The contents is love, human love from beginning to end (Herder). 3. The Song of Songs is throughout a moral book . . . a heroic book of a true woman's love. If this be something ethical, and ethics belongs in our Sacred Scriptures, then Canticles belongs in our Bible (Herder). 4. It was composed in northern Palestine, while Tirzah was the capital of the Israelitish state 920 B.C. 5. Canticles is a drama, in the full and

¹ *Ibid.* p. 90. ² *Ibid* p. 130.

³ Stickel *Das Hohelied in seiner Einheit und dramatischen Gliederung mit Uebersetzung und Beigaben* Berlin, 1888. ⁴ *The Song of Songs, translated from the Hebrew with occasional notes, by the Rev. William C. Daland, A. M., Pastor of the First Seventh-Day Baptist Church, Leonardsville, N. Y.*, 1888.

strict sense of this term with acts and scenes. 6. It was intended by the poet for representation through living persons."

Stickel holds that it has to do, not only with the love of the Shulamite, but also with the love of a shepherd and shepherdess, who are distinct from the other characters.

Daland, an American scholar, considers it a product of the Chokma literature, and a companion piece of the Book of Job. He says the Book of "Job depicts the experience of a man who, though in the midst of fiery trials and afflictions, has the divine gift of wisdom, the fear and perfect trust of Yahweh, which enables him to withstand them all, and to come forth as the pure gold from the furnace. The Song of Songs shows us a woman who, by virtue of the same grace, is victorious over the temptations peculiar to a woman in the time of Solomon, and who remains true to her plighted troth and to her virtue, against the allurements of the most luxurious court in history."¹

He considers that both of these books have an ethical purpose, which would be subserved, even if the basis of the narratives were fictitious.

He says : "The treasures of divine wisdom in the Proverbs need exemplification. In Ecclesiastes, we have the picture of a life conflict ; the deepest struggles of a noble soul are there portrayed, its alternations of light and darkness, hope, belief, and skepticism made vivid and personal, but issuing in the grand conclusion 'Fear God.' In Job we have a mighty spirit wrestling amidst darkness and uncertainty, with that most terrible of problems, the mys-

¹ *Ibid.* p. 8.

terious providence of God. With every human influence adverse, and smitten as was no man save the Man of Sorrows, Job stands upon the firm rock of Yahweh's integrity, and proves the reality of that wisdom which is his fear. The Song of Songs is needed to complete the series. The most personal of all, the most simple and natural, it has for that very reason been misunderstood. Types, symbols, prophecies, and allegories have been imagined in this book, to give it some wonderful significance, and every attempt is full of inconsistencies and necessary perversions of the true meaning of the words of the poet. In this book there is as noble a soul, engaged in a struggle as momentous, with a foe as subtle and terrible as ever sacred poet has celebrated in song, and the victory is as glorious, and peradventure lies nearer the sympathy of the true human heart, than that of the upright man of Uz, or of Qoheleth himself. If any, however, choose to find in the Shulamite a typical reference to the church, the shepherd must be considered the type of Christ. Solomon had better be regarded as the type of the evil world with its allurements and snares.

•The book is divided into five parts, or ‘acts,’ by the four-times recurring refrain, ‘I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem,’ etc. Twice it is as follows:

'I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem, by the gazelles or the hinds
of the field,
That ye stir not up, nor awake love till it please.'

The third time, at the end of the third act, in which is seen the climax of feeling on the part of the Shulamite, it is :

'I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem !
Oh ! that ye would find my love !
Oh ! that ye would tell him that I am sick with love ?

At the close of the fourth act it is abbreviated by the omission of the words 'by the gazelles or the hinds of the field.' "¹

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 11-12.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORIES OF ISRAEL.

During the past year the contributions to the history of Israel have been important. The work prepared by Stade in Oneken's Series of Universal Histories has been completed. The general characteristics of this work have already been indicated.¹ Stade belongs to the most advanced wing of Old Testament critics, represented by the school of Graf and Wellhausen. He holds, as has been stated in a previous volume, that the Israelites were never in Egypt; that they were simply a Semitic tribe, like the modern Arabs, who crossed the Jordan, thus receiving their name as Hebrews, and who gradually conquered Western Palestine. According to Stade, the oldest monument that we have of Hebrew literature is the song of Deborah. His view, as to the origin and succession of the Pentateuchal documents, is essentially the same as that of the school of critics to which he belongs. In his history he gives much space to the discussion of the sources of Israelitish history, as well as to the religious views of the Israelites. His work, therefore, is more particularly a history of Israelitish literature and Israelitish theology than of Israelitish government.

¹ *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1884, vol. ii. pp. 33 ff.; 1888, vol. v. pp. 59 ff.

In the second part of his work he treats the history of Israel from the time of the exile to that of Ezra. He insists, with apparent justice, that the carrying away of the Judæans was in no true sense an exile or a captivity. It was not an exile because they were permitted to go as families and communities, and it was not a captivity, for with the exception of certain leaders all had their freedom. They were permitted to have their homes and were in a position to be highly prosperous. The Judæans who went to Babylonia seemed to have been in better circumstances than those who were carried away from the Northern Kingdom to Assyria.

The depression from which the people suffered did not arise from lack of the comforts of life, but from the fact that they were separated from Yahweh's land and from the worship of His house, and the bread even which they ate was polluted because the fruits could not be offered to the Lord in a strange land.

Stade claims that it was about this period that the History of Israel, from Judges to Kings inclusive, was treated from a Deuteronomistic standpoint. The facts of the history were thus made to subserve certain moral lessons.

Both in Jeremiah and Ezekiel we find Messianic promises of the reunion and restoration of those who had been carried away from the Northern and Southern Kingdom to their own lands. Ezekiel, however, lays special stress upon the fact that each man must suffer for the consequences of his own sin. He sets forth the thought that the banishment of the Judæans from their own land is not due to the sins of their fathers, but to their own transgressions. Ezekiel has a vision of a new temple far ex-

ceeding in extent and magnificence that of Solomon. He evidently expects there will be miraculous changes in the character of the land.

It is needless to mention that Stade considers that the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah are from the hand of another prophet, whom with other critics he calls Deutero-Isaiah. He holds that this prophet forms a transition to the post-exilian writers. He says that Deutero-Isaiah is completely wanting in that which is characteristic of the pre-exilian prophets, namely, that he is seized by God's Spirit in order to announce to Israel their sins. He is completely wanting in the consciousness of mediating between Israel and Yahweh. His prophecies are rather of a reflective character. The addresses, which can certainly be referred to him, belong to the period which elapsed between Crœsus' fall and Cyrus' attack upon him in the time of the conflict of the Persians against the cities of Asia Minor.¹

He recognizes two great truths, which stand in reciprocal relation to each other. Israel is no longer one of the peoples and Yahweh is no more a national God. The God of Israel's salvation and Israel take a central position in the world's history. Yahweh is exalted above this earth and above that which is worshipped in it as supernatural. And Yahweh's people have in their history a calling laid upon them by Yahweh for the benefit of all nations. Yahweh has become the only God, and all deities who have been recognized beside Him are emptied of their activity and power and sink together into nothingness.

¹ *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Berlin, 1888, zweiter Theil, p. 73.

We, therefore, first find in Deutero-Isaiah the monotheistic representation of Judaism and the fact that other gods do not exist.

He maintains the same theory regarding the Servant of Yahweh, which is held by the advanced critics of the modern school. As is well known, the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah contain the teaching regarding the servant of Yahweh. It is a favorite theory of Professor Delitzsch, as well as of some other conservative scholars, that while in some chapters the servant of Yahweh is co-extensive with all Israel, in others he is to be limited to the martyr congregation in Israel, and in still others, to an individual who is indicated in Is. liii.

While Stade considers the interpretation with reference to the pious congregation and to an individual as natural enough, he thinks that the servant of Yahweh never indicates anything but the whole historical people of Israel.

Like Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah expects a wonderful transformation of the earth in connection with the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom. Jerusalem is to be rebuilt and the expectations for the future are of an earthly character.

There is no place in Deutero-Isaiah for the Messianic King. In this respect he marks an advance upon Ezekiel. In the Book of Ezekiel, the Messianic King occupies only the shadowy form of a prince. In Deutero-Isaiah Yahweh is Israel's king. Stade claims, therefore, that the Messianic hopes of Deutero-Isaiah are closely connected with those of Ezekiel and are a further development of them.

The monotheistic representation of God in Judaism and the expectation that the heathen would accept this mono-

theistic representation of God and obey the precepts of the moral law without becoming Jews, go back, as Stade thinks, to Deutero-Isaiah.

Stade says the significance of the period from the return under Cyrus until the reform of Ezra is not commonly apprehended. "It signifies an attempt to arrange the worship and existence of the state on the territory of the fathers . . . under the pre-supposition that in this way the fulfillment of the Messianic hopes had begun, and to carry through this arrangement by means of the Deuteronomie codex, which had been essentially enlarged through the incitation of Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah."

The pre-supposition that the return to Palestine meant the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom predicted by the prophets led to bitter disappointment. The Holy Land did not become a land of marked fruitfulness. The king in David's line did not appear. The congregation remained under the dominion of the heathen. It was exposed to great danger through the infusion of old Israelitish elements. This was thwarted only by two immigrations under the lead of Ezra and of Nehemiah.

Stade says it is commonly supposed that the return from the exile took place under the leadership of a descendant of David, Zerubbabel, as secular, and of the High Priest, Joshua, as the spiritual head of the people. He says that this view in all essential points is incorrect, and that the Chronicler has misunderstood his sources.

Stade's contribution to the History of the People of Israel in Oncken's Series ends with the history of pre-Christian Judaism until the Grecian period. The part which treat of the history from the end of the Jewish State

until the origin of Christianity, by Oscar Holtzmann, belongs to the New Testament department.

Renan has issued the first volume of the eighth edition of his *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel*,¹ which has been translated into English and published in America.² It is needless to say that this is the work of an unbelieving critic, and yet it is an interesting and suggestive book. Instead of exhibiting the process of preparing the stones and laying the foundations of the building of history, he presents us with a completed edifice. His work is based rather on a philosophy of history than a critical induction of sources.

He says, "For a philosophical spirit, three histories are of pre-eminent interest, that of Greece, that of Israel and that of Rome. These three histories combined constitute what may be called a history of civilization; since civilization is the result of the alternate contributions of Greece Judea and Rome. Greece took a leading part, for she founded in the fullest sense of the term rational and progressive humanity. Our science, our art, our literature, our philosophy, our ethics, our polities, our strategy, our diplomacy, our maritime and international laws are of Greek origin

Greece had in the circle of her intellectual and moral activity only one blank, but that blank was considerable. She despised the lowly and did not feel the need of a just God. Her philosophers . . . were tolerant of the iniquities of this world . . . the idea of a universal religion had never come to them. Israel furnished what was lacking in the Hellenistic spirit.

¹ Paris, 1887. ² *History of the People of Israel*, Boston, 1888.

The grand creations of Greece and Judea could not alone have conquered the world. Rome occupied this extraordinary role; by prodigies of civic virtue she created a force in the world, and this force in reality served to propagate the Greek and Jewish work, that is to say, civilization.”¹

In distinction from Stade and Wellhausen, he lays down an important principle with reference to the fundamental character of the Patriarchal age, and in this respect shows that he has a true conception of the philosophy of Israelitish history. He says in his first volume, “The grand movement of the religion of Israel which has drawn the world into its whirlpool has hardly commenced. The vocation of Israel is not evident . . . At first blush, it might be taken for a little Syro-Arabic people like the others . . . The period of the greatest importance in the life of great men is their youth . . . It is in the patriarchal age that the destiny of Israel began to be determined. Nothing in the history of Israel is explicable without the patriarchal age.” . . . He says, “that according to a certain class of French critics, the history of Israel should be a blank before David.” In his view such a method is a negation of history. He considers the legendary materials which the modern critics claim to find especially in the Hexateuch of greatest value in writing history.²

In one respect Renan differs radically from the modern schools of critics. The ordinary theory of Israelitish history, as well as of Israelitish religion, is that it presents

¹ Cf. the French edition, pp. i–v, and the English translation, pp. vi–x.

² French edition, pp. x–xiv.

certain stages in a development which may be determined or not, according to the standpoint of critics, by the presence of the Divine Spirit in history, at least from a pantheistic point of view.

Renan excludes the supernatural element in Israelitish history. He seems to be an adherent of the principle of evolution in his theory of the origin of the human race. He says, "The passage from the animal state to humanity did not take place upon a single part of the globe, or by a single spontaneous effort . . . The family was formed by the most atrocious means; millions of women stoned to death, paved the way to conjugal fidelity."¹

The following quotation shows how he eliminates the supernatural: "No signs have been discovered in nature of any intelligent agent superior to man . . . Prayer never encountered any being that it can turn from its purpose. No prayer or aspiration has ever healed a disease or won a battle. . . ."²

The belief in the spiritual nature of the soul and in immortality, far from being an outcome of refined reflection, is in fact a remnant of the childish conceptions of men incapable of making a serious analysis of their ideas."³

While he shows that he is an adherent of the principle of development in his theory of the origin of mankind, his view of the doctrine of a Divine Being does not seem to indicate this principle.

It is a favorite theory of the critics of the modern school

¹ *History of the People of Israel till the Time of King David*, Boston, 1888, pp. 1-5.

² *Ibid.* 23.

³ *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel*, Paris, 1887, p. 41.

that monotheism is a product of the Israelitish prophets of the eighth century. Renan, however, says, and rightly as we think, if the statement be limited to Israel, "The march toward monotheism, which is the whole *circulus* of the life of these peoples, is in reality nothing more than a return to the intuitions of their first days."¹

Renan does not claim anywhere, as formerly, that the Semitic peoples had a genius for monotheism, since this has clearly been disproved by historical investigation. But he is certainly inconsistent with himself when he maintains that the Israelites at the earliest period of their history were adherents of monotheism. While this view is undoubtedly correct, the question is how he can explain it on the basis of his theory of history.

He considers that the patriarchal Elohim ought to be considered anterior and superior to Yahwism, or Chemoshism . . . It was an advance . . . when these elohim were unified in a single Elohim as one being. But it was a decadence when they received a proper name, Chemosh, Yahweh, Rimmon, and constituted for each people a jealous, egotistical, personal god. Only the people of Israel corrected these faults of their national gods.

Yahweh is a particular god, the god of a human family and of a country. Elohim is the universal god, the god of the human race . . . Neither Christianity nor Islam recognizes Yahweh.² In another place he says, that Yahwism was an obliteration of the primitive Elohim. The prophets, and especially Jesus, expelled Yahweh, the ex-

¹ *Ibid.* p. 62.

² French edition, pp. 85-86; English edition, pp. 71-72.

elusive god of Israel. At that remote age, Yahweh did not differ much from Moloch. "The good of the nation which he protects is the supreme good, all the rest is subordinated . . . Yahweh is a national god, that is to say, a very bad god . . . The basis of Elohim remained living and strong until Yahweh lost all his peculiar characteristics, until he came to be replaced by the equivalent Elohim, the inoffensive Adhonai."¹

This theory of Renan's in regard to the application of Yahweh to the God of Israel as a national deity is correct. Yahweh, in the Old Testament, is as much a proper name as Jesus in the New Testament. But the name Yahweh among the Israelitish prophets does not indicate what is termed by the critics monolatry, but rather the God of redemption and revelation.

His view regarding the character of Yahweh as a cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant is not based on an induction from Old Testament passages, but is the result of a pre-conceived theory derived partly from unbelieving critics and from his studies in classical mythology.

The History of the Hebrews,² by Kittel, belongs to the series of universal histories, published by Perthes of Gotha. Kittel is a conservative German theologian, but he has adopted essentially the position of the modern critical school with reference to the origin and composition of the Pentateuch. He differs, however, from the adherents of this school in maintaining firmly the value of ancient tradition, and considers it a great weakness in the treatment of Israelitish history by Meyer and Stade that they

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 173–175; 148–150.

² *Geschichte der Hebräer*, Gotha, 1888.

undervalue tradition. After an introduction, in which he considers the importance of the subject, various works on Hebrew history, the land, climate, animals, inhabitants and neighbors of the Israelites, he discusses in the first book the period until the conquest of Canaan. The first half of the first volume is largely taken up with the discussion of the sources of this period as found in the Hexateuch. He treats of tradition and its proper place, the history of criticism, Deuteronomy and the time of its composition, the Deuteronomic parts of the book of Joshua, sources of the Yahwistic and Elohistic documents, their relations to one another and to Deuteronomy, the priesthood and reasons for the post-exilian composition of the Priests' Code. He next gives a history of this period. In the first chapter he presents the age of the patriarchs and the traditions as they are found in various sources, as given by the Elohist, the Yahwist and in the Priests' Code. He then gives the historical contents of these accounts of the patriarchs, after testing and arranging the sources. In the second chapter he follows the same order with regard to Moses and the journey through the wilderness. He first treats of the various traditions and then of the historical form of the account concerning Moses. In the third chapter he presents the conquest of Canaan, first giving a critical analysis of the sources, including Judges, i, ii, 1-5, and then discusses the progress of the conquest in detail.

MONOGRAPHS.—The excellent series on the Men of the Bible, noticed in our last issue, has been continued and is republished in this country. The volume on Samuel and

Saul, their Lives and Times,¹ by Deane, requires no special notice. The author's treatment of the subject is conservative and will be found instructive.

Solomon, His Life and Times, by Canon Farrar,² is a fine example of word painting. In connection with the accession of Solomon he presents a well-known theory in regard to the conspiracy of Adonijah to secure the throne. According to this theory, Adonijah's request presented through Bathsheba to Solomon for the hand of the beautiful Abishag, his father's concubine, was simply a part of this conspiracy, as it was customary for the successor in the royal line to inherit the women of the court.

He maintains that the book of Ecclesiastes was due to the general influence given to Jewish thought by Solomon, although it cannot have been written by him.

The volume on *Elijah, His Life and Times*, by Milligan,³ is from a competent hand. It is also written from a strictly conservative standpoint, and in this respect differs from the volume by Cheyne, on *The Hollowing of Criticism*,⁴ which is made up of nine discourses on the Life of Elijah, together with an appendix which seeks to answer the question: "To what extent should results of historical and scientific criticism, especially of the Old Testament, be recognized in sermons and teaching?" He takes the bull by the horns, when he says: "Let critical scholars open their mouths, in the pulpit and out of the pulpit, in season and out of season, and have the courage to be dogmatic. It

¹ New York (without date.)

² London (without date.)

³ New York (without date.)

⁴ London, 1888.

is both useless and needless for them to meet non-Christian assaults on the Old Testament Scriptures by counter-arguments ; change the point of view, and the arguments of scientific critics vanish into thin air."

He illustrates his position as follows : "The so-called cosmogony" found in Genesis i. 1, which ends with the middle of Genesis ii. 4, "was not meant to be taken as an account of what we call 'facts'; it is not a specimen of rudimentary science or pseudo-science . . . A pious Hebrew writer takes a semi-mythical narrative, current either in his own or some neighboring nation, and moulds it into a vehicle of spiritual truth. Can we be surprised at this, remembering the numerous undoubtedly mythic phrases in the language of the Old Testament? . . . It is useless then for the experts in other subjects to depreciate this document on scientific grounds ; it is the underlying spiritual truth against which alone with due seriousness it is admissible to argue."

While he thinks the "weak brethren" should be considered, he holds that the results of criticism should not be hidden from them. He divides the "weak brethren" into two classes, "those who are weak by nature and those who have become so through the fault of their teachers." He says that "those who are weak by nature will feed on those precious truths of heart theology, some of which should be conspicuous in every sermon, and will leave the rest ; those who are weak by education will at least see that you personally have your feet planted on a rock, and will ask how it is that what would make *them* stumble only seems to give *you* a bolder and more rejoicing faith . . . He who said, 'Destroy not the weak brethren'

(Romans xiv, 15) was himself unweariedly active in enlightening the conscience and enlarging the point of view of his spiritual children.”¹

It will be seen from this that Canon Cheyne’s position with reference to the use which clergymen should make of the facts of criticism is quite different from that of Professor Delitzsch. Professor Delitzsch maintains that critical theories are for scholars only, and the church at large is liable to suffer detriment from the popular discussion of such theories. The position of Cheyne seems to be more consistent, but those who feel constrained to adopt certain critical views as to the origin of Old Testament books and as to the materials of which they are composed should be careful how they shock the prejudices of the laity. Greatest care should be used in the adoption of new theories until the consensus of Christian scholarship has fully established them. It is certain that the Old Testament has nothing to fear from the discoveries of modern science and criticism. We may be called upon to revise our views as to the human side of Scripture, but God’s truth will remain unchanged. The position of a reverent investigator is more likely to be useful to the church.

The last two volumes which we shall mention are fully abreast of the most scientific scholarship of the present day. The volume on *Isaiah: His Life and Times, and the Writings which bear His Name*, by Canon Driver, known amongst scholars as the author of *The Hebrew Tenses*, and to our American public by his lessons in the *Sunday School Times*, is based on the modern critical theory with reference to the authorship of Isaiah.²

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 188–196.

² London (without date.)

He classes among "prophecies unrelated to Isaiah's age" xxiv–xxvii; xiii, 1–xiv, 23; xxxiv–xxxv; xl–lxvi. He gives special attention to these last chapters, devoting nearly the latter half of the book to their discussion, under the headings, "The Great Prophecy of Israel's Restoration," "Theology and literary style of chapters xl–lxvi." In chapter v, he discusses the authorship of the last part of Isaiah, considering the internal evidence, that of language and style, and that of theology and thought; and maintains that the author must have written for the exiles in Babylonia and must have worked among them.

Cheyne's treatise on *Jeremiah: His Life and Times*,¹ is of especial interest on account of the discussion which he gives in regard to the origin and publication of Deuteronomy, in chapters vi and vii. He considers that Deuteronomy was the "ancient law transformed." He raises the question whether the preparation of this book involved fraud or needful illusion. He emphatically rejects the idea of fraud, but he adopts the saying of Novalis, "All transition begins with illusion." Cheyne says, "Both historically and educationally it is clear that at certain stages of development, men cannot receive the pure truth which must therefore be enclosed for a time in a husk of harmless error. The history of the Prophets shows us, that, as a matter of fact, Providence employed much illusion in training its instruments. Jeremiah himself at length became aware of this in his own case, and not without a momentary disappointment at the discovery. 'Thou hast deceived me, Jehovah,' he exclaims, 'and I was deceived'"

¹ London, 1888.

(or ‘enticed’; *Jer.* xx, 7, R. V.) . . . The illusion respecting the authorship of Deuteronomy lasted for centuries, and produced, as we may reverently suppose, no injurious effect upon the Church. But in modern times and especially now, . . . to ask men to believe that Deuteronomy was written by Moses, or that its substance was spoken though not written by Moses and supernaturally communicated to Hilkiah would be to impose a burden upon the Church which it is not able to bear.”

Cheyne says, “The object of the Deuteronomist was to keep up the historical continuity of the ‘Mosaic’ school of legalists, the orthodox school, one may call it, in opposition to those ‘lying pens’ of which Jeremiah speaks (*Jer.* viii, 8). The object of Hilkiah was to terminate the painful hesitancy of the believers in a spiritual religion by producing the joint work of some well trained priest and prophet as the only suitable and divinely appointed law of the state. To abolish polytheism and the dangerous local shrines a new prophecy and a new law book of a more efficacious character than any that had yet been seen was really necessary. These were provided in the original book of Deuteronomy.”¹

Cheyne does not attempt to determine who was the author of Deuteronomy, but he gives an interesting quotation from Maspero, who says, “It was a common practice of Egyptian scribes to insert in their transcripts of great religious or scientific works a statement that the writing in question had been ‘found’ in a temple. For example, chapter lxiv of the ‘Book of the Dead’ . . . was

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 78–80.

declared in certain documents to have been found by an Egyptian prince, in the reign of Mencheres, beneath the feet of the god Thoth.” He also mentions other books in which the same formula is used and says, “may there not then (considering the other traces of an acquaintance with Egypt in the book) be an imitation of this custom when Deuteronomy xxxi, 26, makes Moses say, *Take this book of Torah, and put it by the side of the Ark of the Covenant?* The position assigned to the law book beside the Ark . . . corresponds to that of the ‘coffer of books at the feet of Anup.’ . . . Is it not possible that the book was—not lost by accident, nor yet placed in the sanctuary with the intention to deceive—but simply taken to the temple and formally placed there as authoritative Scripture, and then communicated to Josiah with the view of its promulgation?”¹

Pinnock has produced a work² which is designed to combine the Bible and contemporary history, covering the ground of the Old Testament. It is entirely uncritical and the two large volumes contain less valuable and trustworthy matter than Sayee’s little book entitled *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*.³

GEOGRAPHY.—There is a most important connection between the geography and history of a country. There can be no question that physical and moral traits are

¹ *Ibid.* p. 85,

² *The Bible and Contemporary History, an Epitome of the History of the World from the Creation to the end of the Old Testament, based on the inspired Record, and elucidated by means of the latest scientific and historical Researches.* London, 1887.

³ London (without date).

greatly dependent upon peculiarities of land and climate, hence the study of the geography of Palestine is closely related to the history and theology of Israel.

We call Palestine the Holy Land. In this designation, the term holy corresponds to the meaning of the Hebrew word *qudhash* "to be separate." Perhaps there is no other country in the world, which is so separated from other countries, and so well adapted to be the residence of a separated or holy people, as the domain of ancient Israel.

It is certain that no other territory has received such attention from learned travelers and explorers, as Palestine. The science of sacred geography is a product of the present century, speaking from a scientific standpoint. While Burckhardt, Buckingham, Schubert, Russegger have made important contributions to the science of sacred geography, our own countryman, Dr. Edward Robinson, according to the testimony of a recent German scholar, Ankel, introduced a new epoch for the geography of Palestine; but it was reserved for Ritter to gather all the scattered materials, in regard to this country, into one scientific treatise. Van De Velde, Seetzen, Tobler, de Luynes have made important contributions to this science.

But the crowning work has been accomplished by various exploration societies sent out from different countries, especially by "The English Palestine Exploration Fund," whose labors began in the year 1865, and which have been continued to the present time. As has been mentioned in a previous volume,¹ "The Palestine Exploration Society of America" was founded in 1870, but after issu-

¹ *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1884, Vol. ii, p. 47.

ing four statements, the last of which appeared Jan. 1887, it was discontinued for lack of funds. In the same year, the German Palestine Society was formed. As its means have been limited, it has been content with subsidiary investigations. Ankel says, that while the English Society has been more concerned to promote the interests of Biblical study, the German Society has devoted more attention to the scientific aspects of investigation. It should also be mentioned, that in the year 1882 an "Orthodox Palestine Society" was formed in Russia, which has three aims in view: Learned contributions and investigations; aid for orthodox pilgrims; and the cultivation of the orthodox faith in the Holy Land.

We have now reached a point where it is exceedingly desirable, that some one should subject the facts collected to a scientific arrangement in a manner, similar to that of Ritter.

This work has been performed on a small scale by the scholar, already mentioned, Dr. Otto Ankel, who has written a monograph entitled, *Outlines of the Geography of the Land West of the Jordan*.¹ This little work, which covers 131 pages, embraces the most important information in regard to this country, and seems to come from the hand of a competent scholar. He acknowledges his obligations to Professors Baudissin, Kayser and Wellhausen in Marburg, and to Professor Guthe of Leipzig. He treats of the present condition of investigations in Palestine, of the position of the land west of the Jordan,

¹ *Grundzüge der Landesnatur des Westjordanlandes. Entwurf einer Monographie des Westjordanischen Palästina*, von Otto Ankel. Frankfurt a. M., 1887.

with reference to the rest of the world, its physical features, its climate, its vegetation, and the history of agriculture, together with that of the climate of this land. Besides, there is an appendix giving tables of the climatic changes in Jerusalem.

The following quotation, gives his view of the peculiar situation of the Holy Land: "In spite of its apparently favorable position between the ancient states of civilization, the land of the Jews took no part in the great commerce of the world. The billows arising from the conflicts of these peoples, sometimes reached the boundaries of this land; the heart of it remained untouched. It was separated from Egypt by land and water. It lay on the periphery of the great Asiatic kingdoms, and offered . . . no allurement to conquerors."

Its participation in an inland and carrying trade was small. No main artery of travel passed through this out-of-the-way-land . . . The path of the caravans from Damascus to Petra led along through the land east of the Jordan on the edge of the wilderness, and was especially suited for the use of camels; the one to Egypt passed over upper Jordan and crossed South Galilee." He shows that the way through the land east of the Jordan and then over the Jordan to Jerusalem and Hebron and southward, was impassable for camels. Hence, although the land west of the Jordan was surrounded by roads for commerce, it was, nevertheless, cut off from communication with other nations. He says, "According to the divine plan, the idea of monotheism was to be developed undisturbed, and then carried further by ways already in existence."¹

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

In his chapter on the “History of the cultivation of the ground and of the climate of the land west of the Jordan,” he shows that for about four thousand years there has not been any considerable change in the number of the trees west of the Jordan, and essentially no change in the climate.¹

He quotes with emphasis, in opposition to Voltaire and the superficial skeptics of the present day, the testimony of classic and other writers regarding the wonderful, natural fertility of the land, and adopts the language of one of the special papers in “The Survey of Western Palestine.” “It is no idle dream to suppose that Palestine might in a few years become a land flowing with milk and honey : even with the present inhabitants under an upright government the land would in a short time change its appearance, and, as it is, the country has changed in parts to a small extent, due to the alteration in the government, brought about by the influence of public opinion of the West, asserting itself even in Syria . . . At present, however, Palestine-Philistia in particular has not a tithe of the population that it would support ; its fruit trees are left to take care of themselves, its waters allowed to run under ground instead of on the surface.”²

He says that, “in presence of this competent judgment, mistrustful skepticism must be dumb, and that it is a fixed fact that the natural condition of the lands west of the Jordan, with the active co-operation of man, permits a rejuvenation, a regeneration of the land ; it can again become, what it was once, a land flowing with milk and honey, it

¹ *Ibid.* p. 121.

² *Ibid.* pp. 123-129.

can again have a high significance for the civilized world, and a prosperity similar to that of David and Solomon."

Geikie's Holy Land and the Bible,¹ in two volumes, does not add anything to our scientific knowledge of Palestine, but is valuable as the work of a diligent Bible student for ministers and Sunday School teachers. The treatment is popular, and describes the most important places in the Holy Land, with reference to the ancient and modern literature of the subject.

The religious Tract Society has published a new edition of Dawson's *Egypt and Syria, their physical features in relation to Bible history*,² in its series of *By-paths of Bible Knowledge*. The work is the result of personal observations, made during the winter of 1883-4, when the writer devoted some attention to the less known features of the geology of portions of Egypt and Palestine, with a special reference to the bearing of facts of this kind on Bible history. In seven chapters he discusses the Delta, the Valley of the Nile, the Geography of the Exodus, Judea and Jerusalem, the Jordan and the Dead Sea, prehistoric and historic men, past present and future. In this treatise he takes into account the recent investigations in Egypt.

The "Fourth Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund," entitled *Tanis*, part second, has just appeared.³ It contains much minute information, without any extended reference

¹ London, Paris, New York and Melbourne, 1887.

² The Religious Tract Society, 1887.

³ *Tanis, Part ii, Nebesheh, (A. M.) and Defenneh (Tahpanhes)*, by W. M. Flinders Petrie, with chapters by A. S. Murray and F. L. L. Griffith, London, 1888.

to Bible history. There are, however, some interesting illustrations, especially of the book of Jeremiah.

ARCHÆOLOGY.—Hardly less important in the study of the history of a people than their geography, is an account of their manners and customs, which are described in works on Archæology. The past year has been fruitful in such work. Schegg's *Biblical Archaeology*,¹ by a late Roman-Catholic Professor in the University of Munich, divides the subject as follows :

First, land and people ; second, worship ; third, political institutions.

The well known work of the late Professor Keil,² has recently been translated into English, and published by T. & T. Clark, of Edinburgh. Its merits have long been recognized by the learned world. The main divisions of the first and second volumes are : I. The scene of the biblical history. II. First Part of Biblical Archaeology, the religious relations of the Israelites. 1. The Israelitish places of worship. 2. Sacred officials. 3. The various acts of worship. 4. Worship in relation to the times fixed for its observance. III. Second Part of Biblical Archaeology. Social Relations of the Israelites. 1. The domestic relations of the Israelites. 2. The every day occupations of the Israelites. 3. State relations.

This work contains an extended and learned discussion of the subjects treated, from a strictly conservative standpoint, and with scarcely any reference to the points now under debate among critics.

¹ *Biblische Archäologie*. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1886–7.

² *Manual of Biblical Archaeology*, Edinburgh, 1887–1888.

Dr. Bissell, under the auspices of the American Sunday School Union, has produced an admirable work on the same subject,¹ which is divided as follows: I. Domestic antiquities, II. Civil antiquities, III. Sacred antiquities.

Conder's *Syrian Stone Lore*² is a book which has been severely criticised, and which in its discussion of the Caananites, the Phoenicians, the Hebrews, the Jews and the Samaritans, does not add greatly to our information. Where Conder alludes to points of criticism, as for instance in the philological indications of the antiquity of the Pentateuch, he displays an inadequate acquaintance with the subject and a dilettante treatment of it.

During the year 1887, two works appeared on the Temple of Solomon, one on that of Ezekiel, and one on the Temple in the Time of Christ.

The treatise on the Temple of Solomon is by E. C. Robbins,³ F. S. A., a practical architect, who gives a review of the various theories respecting the form and style of architecture of the Temple of Solomon, which he groups under three classes: 1. the African, which assumes that the Temple was designed on the model of Egyptian edifices, or in the Egyptian style; 2. the European, which assumes that it partook of the forms and design peculiar to Grecian architecture; 3. the Asiatic, which asserts that it is to Phoenicia, Assyria, Babylonia and Persia that we must look for the style of architecture employed.

¹ *Biblical Antiquities; a hand-book for use in Seminaries, Sabbath Schools, families and by all students of the Bible.* Philadelphia, 1888.

² London, 1886.

³ *The Temple of Solomon, a review of the various theories respecting its form and style of architecture.* London, 1887.

Robins says he thinks it is to Asia, and not to Africa, that we must look for the true architectural type. Not indeed for the form and arrangement of the plan, (this was emphatically Jewish), but for the form and styles of art adopted in details and accessories.

He thinks that as a Tyrian architect, and Tyrian artisans were employed in the designs and construction of the buildings at Solomon's own request, the style of art prevailing at the period in the capital of Phoenicia would doubtless be stamped on every part.

Friedrich,¹ also argues that the temple of Solomon was a monument of Phoenician art, and he considers that Stade is right in the assumption, that Solomon's palace was the chief building, and that the Temple was simply a royal sanctuary designed for the personal worship of the splendor-loving king.

Sully's work on the temple of Ezekiel's² prophecy, seems to be an example of literalism run mad. He expects that the temple of Ezekiel will be erected in Jerusalem. An architect by profession, he has expended ten years in the study of the subject. The work is elaborate, and contains 110 large quarto pages.

¹ *Tempel und Palast Salomo's, Denkmäler Phönizischer Kunst. Rekonstruktion, Exegese der Baubericht mit Grundrissen und Perspektiven*, von Dr. Thomas Friedrich, Innsbruck, 1887.

² *The Temple of Ezekiel's Prophecy; or, an exhibition of the nature, character, and extent of the building represented in the last nine chapters of Ezekiel, and which is shortly to be erected in the land of Israel, as "A house of prayer for all people". (Isaiah lvi, 7; Mark xi-17) with plates, drawn from the specification of the inspired testimony, by Henry Sully, Nottingham, 1887.*

The volume by Woolf,¹ treats of the tabernacle, the temple of Solomon, that of Zerubbabel and of Herod, and seems to be a work of considerable merit.

¹ *Der Tempel von Jerusalem und seine Maasse.* Von P. O. Woolf O. S. V., Mitglied der Beuroner Benedictiner-Congregation. Graz, 1887.

CHAPTER V.

EXEGESIS.

In America, we have made but limited progress in the scientific interpretation of the Old Testament. There are no recent commentaries known to the writer, which fulfill the demands of scientific scholarship. With the exception of Alexander's commentary on Isaiah, published many years ago, which shows what American scholarship can do, we have nothing which can be compared with the better class of English, and especially German commentaries.

The writers in these volumes have been sharply criticised, at various times, for giving so much space to German theological works, and so little, comparatively, to American and English productions. But any one, who examines the subject, will see how dependent we have been, and still are on Germany for Old Testament commentaries.

The excellent works of the late Albert Barnes were an American production—not to speak of others more or less meritorious—but they cannot be compared for a moment with such series of commentaries, as those of Rosenmüller, or the *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testamente*, or Lange's commentaries, or Keil and Delitzsch's, not to mention the so-called Speaker's Commentary, and others which are from time to time appearing in England.

We have lacked the first prerequisite to such critical commentaries in the comparative absence of Hebrew scholarship. It is to be hoped that during the next twenty years America may produce commentaries, which will rank with such productions as those of Alexander and Cheyne.

It is almost impossible for one, who is not familiar with the subject, to realize how much of our knowledge of the Old Testament is derived from German sources. Our American scholars have drunk almost exclusively at German fountains, from the time of Moses Stuart to the present. The reason for this, is that while Germany has been raising up at its universities generations of Old Testament scholars, our American theologians not only lack the requisite training, but have also been occupied in the solution of the practical questions which have been forced upon us. No critic, therefore, who has an intelligent view of the whole range of Old Testament literature, can be justified in finding fault with the writers in this book, for giving too great attention to foreign works.

GENESIS--The commentary of Spurrell, entitled *Notes on The Hebrew Text of the Book of Genesis*,¹ is prepared from a strictly philological, grammatical and critical standpoint. It is likely to be found of especial value by Hebrew students of the Old Testament. In the appendices, he briefly discusses the origin and succession of the documents, in which he follows the views of the critical school as set forth by his friend Professor Driver. He also treats briefly of the names *El*, *Elohim*, *Yahweh*.

¹ Oxford, 1887.

The common explanation given of the word El, is that it comes from the root *al*, and signifies the strong one. Fleischer, whom Delitzsch and others follow, considers Elohim as the plural of Eloah. They derive it from a root found in the Arabie, which signifies “to wander about, to go hither and thither in perplexity or fear,” and they explain Eloah as signifying the object of fear. Spurrell gives Ewald’s view, who holds that both El and Eloah come from a root signifying to be strong, that of Lagarde who maintains that El signifies the one whom men strive after, that of Nöldeke, who explains El as meaning the leader, Lord, of Dillman, who regards El and Eloah as inseparable and as having the meaning of might. In view of so many different opinions, Spurrell thinks it is impossible to decide.

As is well known, the Jews whenever they find the letters Yhwh, always say Adhonai, but, when the word Adhonai precedes Yhwh, they say Elohim. Spurrell considers it an established fact that the pronunciation of the letters Yhwh suggested by the critics, Yahweh, is the correct one, and that it is either the imperfect of the Qal or of the Hifil of the verb *hawah*, which is an archaic form of the verb *hayah*. This theory seems to be established by the testimony of Theodoret, that the Samaritans pronounced it IABE, and that Epiphanius gives the same spelling as one of the names of God, and refers, by way of explanation, to Exodus iii, 14. If the form Yahweh is considered the imperfect of the Qal, it may mean, “*He that is*;” if it be the imperfect of Hifil, it can be translated, “*He that causes to be*.”

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 371-378.

The new commentary by Professor Delitzsch, already mentioned in another connection, is perhaps the most important which has been produced on this subject, by any pen, whether English or German, for the general scholar. It is not so exact and searching in its analysis as that by Professor Dillmann, mentioned in a previous volume;¹ but it is more suggestive and helpful for the ordinary Biblical student.

With regard to the account of creation, Delitzsch says: "It is no visionary revelation which he commits to writing... No, the author is reproducing what has been handed down. We meet, in his account, the same keynote which, 'resounds from the Ganges to the Nile' (Tuch). The cosmogonic legend is the common property of the most ancient of cultured peoples, and even beyond the ancient regions of culture strikingly similar notions have been found by those who have set foot among the hitherto unknown nations e.g. northern India, and interior Africa.

The cosmogonic legend has experienced the most various mythological transformations; we have it here in its simplest and purest form, in which, no human being having been a spectator of the creation (Job xxxviii, 4), it points back to Divine information as its source. It is part of that primitive revelation, which resounds throughout all heathendom, in reminiscences of every kind. It is God who disclosed to man what we here read.

The true greatness... of this narrative of creation consists in its proclaiming, at a period of universally prevailing idolatry, the true idea of God, which is to this very

² *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, Vol. iii, p. 36.

day the basis of all genuine piety and culture. This monotheism is specifically Israelitish; and the fact that the natural heathen disposition of Israel unceasingly reacted against it, shows that it was no product of nature, but a gift of grace.

They are truths of infinite importance, which are expressed in this account of creation, not as dogmas, but as facts which speak for themselves. These truths are: 1. There is one God, who, as the One Elohim, unites in himself all the Divine, which was by the heathen world shattered to pieces and dispersed among their many elohim. 2. The world is not the necessary and natural emanation of His being, but the free appointment of His will, and brought to pass by His word. 3. The world originated in an ascending gradation of creative acts, and this successive nature of its origin, is the foundation of those laws of development, according to which, its existence continues. 4. The object of creation was man, who is on the one hand the climax of the earthly world, on the other the synthesis of nature and spirit, the image of God himself, and by His appointment the king of the earthly world. These are the great truths with which we are confronted in the tradition of creation, as we have it, free from mythological deformity.”¹

Delitzsch does not try to establish the connection between the days of creation and the geologic periods. He evidently does not hold the theory that the cosmogony of Genesis contains ultimate science, or is designed to teach religious truth in scientific forms. But, rather in a popular

¹ *A New Commentary on Genesis*, New York, 1889, Vol. i, pp. 61-62.

and impressive way to set forth the great truths which he has stated.

PSALMS.—The commentaries on this book produced during the past year have been important. Dr. Forbes, Emeritus-Professor of Oriental languages, Aberdeen, has published a work entitled "*Studies on the Book of Psalms.*" *The structural connection of the book of Psalms, both in single Psalms and in the Psalter as an organic whole.*"¹

He claims that the Psalms are not to be regarded merely as isolated productions, but in that order in which we now possess them. They have been arranged and connected together with very great care, so as to bring out and enforce certain important truths with a clearness and distinctness not to be mistaken. So long as each Psalm is viewed as a separate and unconnected composition, it is easy to explain away its meaning, and to put upon its language very diverse and conflicting interpretations, according to the author, the occasion, and the age to which each critic may refer it. But when the Psalms are seen, in the form in which we now possess them, to have been grouped together as parts of a connected series, in order to bring out and give expression to some definite idea or important truth, we gain a certainty not otherwise to be attained of the meaning to be put upon the whole series, as well as upon individual expressions in each Psalm, which might otherwise be ambiguous."

From this point of view, he comes to the conclusion, that while the Psalms as isolated might refer to certain kings in the Davidic line, viewed as a connected whole they

¹ Edinburgh, 1888.

clearly refer to the Messiah, and must have been designed to excite in Jewish worshippers the expectation of his coming.

In the first book, he finds the keynote of the first three books, not to say of the whole Psalter, in the second Psalm where the inauguration of a king is described whom Jehovah styles His son and sets on His Holy Hill, Zion.

After explaining the Messianic characteristics of this Psalm, he says, "that the Messianic character of the book was still further signalized, to those familiarly acquainted with the principles of parallelistic arrangement, by the trilogy of Psalms (xx, xxi–xxii) placed in the middle of the book, (with nineteen on either side) to mark the *central* thought around which the whole book revolves. The three Psalms set forth the great conflict in which the king is to be engaged in behalf of his people, nay, of the whole world. Psalm xx is the people's prayer for the successful issue of the contest . . . Psalm xxi expresses their thanksgiving for the anticipated victory . . . Psalm xxii sums up both the preceding Psalms."¹

"As book one began with the inauguration on his throne of the Lord's Anointed King and Son, and the predicted conquest of all His opposing foes, which David's warlike reign imperfectly prefigured, so book two closes with the companion picture (in Psalm lxxii), of the final establishment of Messiah's empire, as a kingdom of 'peace and righteousness,' of which Solomon's peaceful reign was a faint adumbration."

He further continues to find in book three (lxxiii–

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 2–5.

Ixxxix) a strong confirmation that all three books are so arranged as to create an earnest expectation and longing for the coming of the Messianic king. He regards Psalm Ixxxix as intended to conclude a series of earthly representatives of David's royal race, and as thus bringing us down to the commencement of the Babylonish captivity. Hence, in book four (xe–evi) he finds a counterpart to the prophetic book Isaiah xl–lxvi with its consolatory purpose, 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God' (cf. Psalm xevi, 1 with Isaiah xhi, 10; Psalm xeviii, 4, 8, with Isaiah xlix, 13 and Iv, 12). He says one whole line in Psalm xeviii, 3, 'all ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God,' is identical in Hebrew with Isaiah lii, 10.

He further establishes his theory, as to the arrangement of the Psalms, by the claim that book five begins with the return from the Babylonish captivity, and quotes in confirmation Psalm evii, 1–3.¹

He holds, in contradistinction to most modern critics, that the Psalms quoted as Messianic in the New Testament were primarily intended by the writers as Messianic and so understood by those who assigned them their place in the Psalter.

Hence, he argues, that 'the idea of the Messiah as a wholly distinct person thus stands out clearly from the very first, and dissipates at once the mistaken notion of Dr. Delitzsch, that David regarded himself as the Anointed *sub specie Christi*,' to the extent at least that he ever so identified himself with the Messiah as to imagine that

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 6–9.

he could never die, but 'considered himself immortal.' Psalm xvi.¹

He holds that the same principle applies to Delitzsch's view with reference to Solomon. Dr. Delitzsch says, 'In the time of David and Solomon, the hope of believers, which was attached to the kingship of David, had not yet fully broken with the present. At that time, with few exceptions, nothing was known of any other Messiah than the Anointed one of God, who was David or Solomon himself.'²

We are inclined to the view that Old Testament saints had less clear views of the Messiah than is commonly supposed. We are in great danger of supposing that Abraham, Moses, David and Isaiah had almost as clear views of the Messiah as the Apostle Paul; but this is undoubtedly not the case, as we see from the views which the disciples held in regard to the nature of Jesus' Messiahship. Like their contemporaries, they thought that His death ended the hope of the Messianic kingdom.

We are not to suppose that each worshipper who came to the Tabernacle with his offering had a clear view of the great atonement which was to be wrought out on the cross, as set forth by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The faithful Israelite was simply walking in the way of God's commandments by faith and not by sight, and was blessed in his obedience. Nor are we to suppose that there was a clearly defined view of the Messiah in the times of

¹ *Messianic Prophecies.* Lectures by Franz Delitzsch, Professor of Theology, Leipzig. Translated from the manuscript by Samuel Ives Curtiss. Edinburgh, 1880, pp. 46-47.

² *Ibid.* p. 51.

David, Solomon, Hezekiah or Josiah, as of a divine person, who was to sit upon the throne of Israel. The Old Testament saints show that they have glimpses of the Messiah. We might call their views photographs taken of him now as prophet, now as priest, and now as king. And when all human helpers failed, and the Messianic hope seems to be lost, the faith of these Old Testament saints rises to Jehovah Himself. It is only in the New Testament that these different photographs are united together and we see the image of the God-man. We do not lose anything by recognizing the progressive, the educational and the historic elements in the Old Testament representations of Messiah. No amount of historic criticism can banish Messianic prophecies from the Old Testament, although our point of view regarding them may be essentially changed.

Dr. Forbes' theory with reference to the careful editing of the Psalms under grand divisions, whatever may be true in regard to it, illustrates an important principle regarding the composition and arrangement of Old Testament books. The Old Testament as we have it, is an organism which has been the product of ages of growth under the guidance of the Divine Spirit. It is not a book in the skies, and so separated from human thought and history, but addressed to men and women in the course of a historical development. It is the product of many pens, but of one Spirit. Doubtless all the books, as we may infer even from tradition, have passed under a careful editorial supervision, which is not less inspired or authoritative than the original hands which wrote it. It is doubtless true, that it is no more necessary to prove that Moses was the author

of the entire Pentateuch, or Isaiah of the prophecies which appear under his name, in order to establish their inspired character, than it would be to prove that all the Psalms were written by David to the same end. The results of established criticism in reverent hands should not be feared.

Professor Cheyne, to whom American and English theologians are so much indebted for his admirable volumes on Isaiah, Jeremiah and Hosea, not to mention his other writings, has produced an excellent commentary on the *Book of Psalms*,¹ or the praises of Israel. Some years ago he issued a translation of the book of Psalms in the Parchment Library Series, which is well known to our American scholars.

In regard to the authorship of the Psalms, he says : "At an earlier day much labor was rather unprofitably spent in defending the Davidic authorship of Psalms transparently non-Davidic. An opposite tendency now prevails. Of the three most distinguished recent critics, Ewald, acknowledges only eleven entire Psalms and some fragments of Psalms as Davidic, Hitzig fourteen, and Delitzsch forty-four; all of these agree to the Davidic authorship of Psalms iii, iv, vii, viii, xi, xviii, xix, 1-7, and two out of three as to that of Psalms ix, x, xii, xiii, xv-xvii, xix, 8-14, xxiv, xxix, xxxiii and ci. Kuenen, however, will admit no Davidic Psalms, though Davidic passages may perhaps have been inserted. In any case, it is quite certain that there are none in the last three books, and the probability is that Ewald's is the most conservative view of the headings at present tenable."

¹ London, 1888.

Cheyne does not hesitate to amend readings where they are difficult, or where the text is hopelessly corrupt to indicate the fact by asterisks. For example, in Psalm ii, 12, he has marked the first line of the much disputed passage translated in our version, 'kiss the son' with asterisks. He says it is very doubtful whether the title 'Son of God' was applied to the Messiah in the time of Christ.

In Psalm xxii he renders the seventeenth verse, translated in the margin of the Revised Version in accordance with the pointing of the Hebrew text 'like a lion my hands and my feet,' as follows: 'For dogs have come about me, the crew of evil-doers have closed me round; they have digged into my hands and feet.' He says in regard to the rendering 'like a lion at my hands and my feet,' which he characterizes as an alternative reading of inferior authority, and which he says few now maintain, 'the genuineness of the text, as represented by the former reading, seems beyond reasonable doubt. We have here a subordinate detail in the behaviour of this troop of half-wild dogs. It is a feature true to life, as Tristram and others have pointed out. The pariah dogs which crawl about in packs in Eastern cities are in general cowardly, but if provoked might rush at a man's hands or feet, and wound them.'¹

In Psalm xlvi he renders the seventh verse.

'As for thy throne, [firm is its foundation,]
God [has established it] forever and ever.'

This, as is well known, is a much disputed passage. Some hold that Elohim may be the title of a king. In

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 15-16. ² *Ibid.* pp. 124-127. ³ *Ibid.* pp. 61-64.

support of this Cheyne quotes a Temanite inscription, discovered by Dr. Euting, where *Alhn* is used for princes. He says this use of the word was therefore a Semitic idiom, but rejects this interpretation because Elohim was used with a distinct reference to Jehovah in the next verse. He concludes that "the sum of the matter is that the only natural rendering of the received text is that of the versions 'Thy throne, O God', and the only natural interpretation that of the Targum, 'thy throne, O Jehovah.'" But is such an abrupt transition to Jehovah conceivable? Must not the poet's idea be this: That the king's success is assured, because *his* throne, (not Jehovah's) is founded in righteousness?"¹

Perhaps no Old Testament commentator now living has been more industrious in revising his commentaries than the Nestor of Old Testament Exegesis, Professor Delitzsch. After the publication of each of them, probably hardly a day has passed without his recording in each volume some new discovery of scientific scholarship, which has brought the subject discussed down to date. It is true of his commentaries, more than those of any other writer, that each edition possesses a distinctive value of its own. For instance, in connection with the first edition of his work on the Psalms, we have a valuable treatise on the accents of the poetical books which has not appeared in any of the subsequent editions. There has just been published in connection with the *Foreign Biblical Library*, edited by Robertson Nicoll, a translation from the inter-leaved copy of Delitzsch's fourth edition of the Psalms. This trans-

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 124-127.

lation should be in the hands of every Old Testament scholar, who wishes to enter into the spirit of the Hebrew Psalter. Perhaps no modern commentator possesses by nature such a sympathy with the poetical writers of ancient Israel as Professor Delitzsch.¹

Hupfeld's Commentary on the Psalms, edited by Dr. Wilhelm Nowack, is a good illustration of the German theory of the composition of the Pentateuch. The first edition, written by Hupfeld, was published in 1855. The second, edited by Riehm, in 1867. The third, by Nowack, in 1888. As has been remarked in a previous volume, it has become customary in Germany to issue new editions of valuable works under the editorship of new generations of scholars, and thus to keep them abreast of the latest investigations in Exegesis.

While there may be a reason for issuing new editions of lexicons, encyclopedias and grammars, it seems as if it would be better that German scholars should publish entirely new books under their own names, than new editions of old ones, which sometimes become so completely their own, as in the case of Dillmann's Genesis, that the name of the original author is set aside.

Nowack has abridged Hupfeld's Commentary, especially by cutting out those passages which were directed against Hengstenberg. The critical point of view remains essentially the same as in the previous edition, which may be characterized as historic-critical.

¹ London, 1887; New York (no date.)

ISAIAH.—The commentary on Isaiah, by Bredenkamp,¹ which was briefly noticed a year ago,² has been completed. As is known, Bredenkamp belongs to the conservative wing of German Theologians. As such, he was called to succeed Professor Wellhausen at Greifswald. His views as to the authorship of Isaiah approach those of the critics of the modern school. He claims that Isaiah is not the author of chapters xxxvi–xxxix nor of xl–lxvi. He says that its authorship by some one else than by Isaiah, is now considered by most critics as established.³ Even such theologians as Delitzsch, Oehler and Orelli renounce the genuineness of these chapters. He says there are three main reasons against the genuineness: 1. the circle of thought in the second part is different from that in the first; 2. the language is smoother and more flowing; 3. the author does not prophesy the Babylonian exile; but he everywhere pre-supposes it; he speaks of Cyrus and the circumstances of the exiles as if they were contemporaries.

He says, “the question concerning the genuineness of the second part is not a dogmatic one, but an exegetico-historical one. Unbiased investigation has led me to the result, that it can have arisen in its present form only in the exile.”

He considers that the difficulties regarding the authorship are not overcome by pre-supposing the person of a

¹ *Der Prophet Jesaia, erläutert*, von C. J. Bredenkamp, Professor der Theologie in Greifswald. Erlangen, 1887.

² *Current Discussions in Theology*, Boston and Chicago, vol. v, p. 24.

³ Bredenkamp says the great majority of critics reject the following passages as not genuine: xiii–xiv, 23; xxi, 1–10; xxiv–xxvii; xxxiv, xxxv; xxxvi–xxxix (exclusive of xxxvii, 21–35); xl–lxvi.

Deutero-Isaiah, who lived with the exiles, since he nowhere betrays an immediate knowledge of the localities and of the worship in Babylonia. He thinks that the author has intentionally withdrawn himself, since otherwise it would be strange that his name should not be known. He maintains that the lost part of Isaiah contains passages that are undoubtedly pre-exilian. He thinks, if it is established, that in the second part of Isaiah, exilian and pre-exilian passages are intermingled, the solution of this riddle is to be found in the assumption that old Isaianic prophetic materials were reproduced and molded by later scholars of Isaiah in the time of the exile.

He says that the second part of the prophecy, regarded as a whole, is the most glorious book of comfort in the Old Testament Scriptures, the gospel uttering the deepest thoughts of divine redemption with new tongues and in the most beautiful language, and which has rightly been compared by Hengstenberg to the Johannine addresses of Jesus.

EZRA, NEHEMIAH AND ESTHER.—Professor Ryssel of Leipsic, has prepared the second edition of the commentary on these books in the series known as the *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testamente*. The first edition was issued by Bertheau, Professor at Göttingen. But on account of his advanced years, the second edition has been prepared with his approval by Professor Ryssel. As is well known, Ezra and Nehemiah are one book. The author holds that they were composed about the year 300 B. C.

CHAPTER VI.

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

Modern Semitic studies shed great light on Old Testament theology. Not only the history of Israel, and the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel have received new interest in the light of Assyrian and Babylonian research, but also the department of Old Testament theology.

This is true, not because the religion of Israel has been evolved from other Semitic religions, but because the divine revelation, made to Israel, is in certain aspects conditioned by the previous history and by the surroundings of Israel.

As has been shown by George Smith and other Assyriologists, the ancient traditions of the race outside of the Old Testament have been preserved in their greatest purity by the ancient Babylonians.

We find in the theology of ancient Israel the divine revelation not only contained in earthen vessels, but also, as we have observed before, on account of its temporal and educational character, containing incomplete and even erroneous statements as to certain forms of religious thought. That is, the revelation which has come from God is allowed to stand in juxtaposition with some forms of human error. There is a striking analogy between the doctrine held among the Hebrews as regards the future

state and that which was current among the ancient Babylonians. These views, which we find presented in the Old Testament, are not revealed from God, but are the remains of what might be called a natural theology.

It is certain that when we read about Sheol and the shadowy existence of departed spirits after death, we are not to see in these representations the teaching of the Divine Spirit, for they are inconsistent with the declarations of Him who came to bring life and immortality to light through the gospel.

From this point of view, it is legitimate for us to trace the correspondence between the views of ancient Israelites in regard to fetishism, monolatry and the state of the dead with views found among other Semitic peoples. It is not incumbent upon us to justify such views as divinely revealed, or to try to harmonize them with inspired statements which we find in the Old Testament.

Two important works have appeared regarding the theology of the ancient Babylonians. One by Sayce, entitled *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religion of the ancient Babylonians*,¹ the other by Jeremias on *The Babylonio-Assyrian Views of the Life after Death*.²

It is clear from Sayce's treatise, that monotheism never existed among the Babylonians or Assyrians. We find at the best monolatry, and yet, the chief divinity does not stand alone. The god almost always has a goddess associated with him as wife, although, originally, the Accadian goddess stood in the relation of mother, rather than wife,

¹ London, 1888. ² *Die Babylonisch-Assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode*, Leipzig, 1887.

to the primitive Merodach.¹ It has been abundantly proved, as has been elsewhere stated, that Renan's assumption that the Semites had a genius for monotheism, is utterly without foundation.

Nor can we account for monotheism among the Israelites as a creation of the prophets of the eighth century. It rather came as a truth originally revealed by God through Moses, oftentimes misunderstood and lost sight of because of the syncretism of the people, until at last, through the preaching of the prophets and the Babylonian exile, it was burned into the consciousness of Israel, never more to be removed.

The most interesting point of contact between the theology of ancient Babylonia and Assyria on the one hand, and of Israel on the other, is in the doctrine of the state after death. The representations of Babylonio-Assyrian and Old Testament theology, regarding the rewards of virtue, are essentially the same : long life, riches, honors and happiness are promised by both. Hence the emphasis in both is laid on this life.

The doctrine regarding the future state is essentially the same ; good and bad alike are gathered in Hades, which receives among the Babylonians various designations as *aral*, the etymology of which is obscure, and *shualu*, which comes from the same Semitic root, as the Hebrew *sheol*, and which is explained as derived from a root *shaal* "to summon for decision." There are nine other designations for Hades in the Assyrian, which do not concern us.²

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 110, 111.

² *Ibid.* pp. 59-65.

The fields of the blessed are described by the Babylonio-Assyrians, but Jeremias says that the removal of some to the land of the blessed is as great an exception as in the Old Testament.¹

It seems also, that the doctrine of the resurrection was held among the ancient Babylonians, and Sayee quotes the opinion of Bishop Warburton with evident approval, that the doctrine of the resurrection was first learned by the Jews in Babylonia.² However this may be, there was no full teaching regarding it, until Christ came, although we have the germs of the doctrine in the Old Testament, and one or two passages, which indisputably teach the doctrine of a personal resurrection.

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 81-82.

² *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion.* London, 1888, p. 40.

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

NEW TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE
OF
NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES.
BY
REV. GEORGE H. GILBERT.

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

CHAPTER I.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.

An opportunity to compare the work of the nineteenth century with that of the fourth, in the department of Biblical Introduction, is afforded by the publication of the oldest extant text-book on the subject, Adrian's *Eισαγωγὴ εἰς τὰς θείας γραφὰς*.¹ The hypothesis of Fabricius, that Adrian was a monk, is confirmed by Gössling. He is regarded as a Greek-speaking Syrian, like Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret, and as a probable contemporary of these Christian fathers. His work is interesting as a product of the grammatic-historical school of Antioch. Adrian's work, though called by him Isagogies, is chiefly concerned with principles of interpretation, which fact illustrates the changed meaning of the term 'introduction.' Among Protestant writers, the science is now more narrowly defined than ever before. The laws of interpretation are no longer considered a part of Introduction.

Adrian's work is based more largely on the Old Testament than on the New, his citations being chiefly from the former. He speaks at length of the anthropomorphic element in the Bible, rejecting all allegorizing explanations

¹ Adrian's *Eισαγωγὴ εἰς τὰς θείας γραφὰς aus neu aufgedeckten Handschriften herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert.* Dr. Friedrich Gössling. Berlin, 1887.

and interpreting in the sober manner that characterized the Antiochian school. The Scriptures call the opposition of the Divine Will to evil “anger” and “wrath,” because amongst us men hostility arises toward that which is opposed to us. In speaking of the manifestation of God’s counsels, the Scriptures use the words “speech” and “mouth,” because among us men the thoughts of the heart are made known by means of the mouth and words. In the second part of his work Adrian speaks of word-figures, and recent discussions of the word *αἰών* may give interest to his remark upon it. The Scriptures use the word, he says, in a threefold sense. It signifies either the life of each individual man, as when Paul says, “I will eat no flesh forevermore ;” or it signifies time in general, as when Joel says, “Judah shall be inhabited forever ;” or it denotes eternity, as when Jesus says, “I give unto them eternal life.”

In the third part of his work Adrian treats chiefly of tropes, giving illustrations of no less than twenty-two varieties.

It seems that there were people in Adrian’s day, as there are in our own, who thought to arrive at the teaching of Scripture by some short route. He says that those who wish to fly and not to advance step by step, regard such principles as he has laid down as superfluous and useless. He refers here especially to the necessity of giving attention to the course of thought, to an exact translation and to an acquaintance with the figures of the Bible. We learn incidentally from this writing of Adrian that the theological students at Antioch in the fourth century studied the Old Testament in the original.

THE SYNOPTISTS.—The synoptic problem, “the most wonderful of all literary problems,” has received no new solution, and the numbers of those seem to be increasing who do not regard a new solution as at all necessary. That a purely oral tradition cannot be accepted as the one source of our Gospels is pretty generally admitted, at least by those who do not hold an interdependence of the synoptic Gospels. A conclusive argument against a purely oral source is sought¹ from the words: “Let him that readeth understand (Mark xiii, 14; Matt. xxiv., 15–16). It is argued that these words cannot have been spoken by Jesus, since He made no reference to a written document. They must, then, have been inserted into the Lord’s discourse by another; and in view of the fact that they are the same in Matthew and Mark, and in exactly the same place, the inference is justified that Matthew and Mark rest here upon a common document. It is assumed that neither one was dependent upon the other. Thus our documents themselves point to an older document. There were probably two main sources of the synoptic Gospels, oral and written, and a third element comes in from the personal reflection of the author, or is due to his linguistic or other peculiarities.²

The date at which our synoptic Gospels were composed can hardly be brought down beyond the destruction of Jerusalem, and certainly not beyond the limit of the first century. Yet attempts are not wanting to establish a later date. The Apologies of Justin Martyr and the

¹ Cf. *The Expositor*, Sept. 1887. Article by T. E. Page, M. A.

² Cf. “*What is the Bible?*” By Geo. T. Ladd, D.D. Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1888.

Dialogue with Trypho have been investigated with the aim of showing that this writer was not acquainted with any one of the Synoptists.¹ He was acquainted with the original of our Gospel according to Mark, which he referred to as the Gospel of Peter, since Mark had his facts from Peter; he was also acquainted with a writing which must have been preserved, in whole or in part, in our canonical Luke. Since Justin speaks of Memorabilia of Apostles, he must have had at least two writings in mind which bore the names of Apostles, and one of these had a close relationship with our present Matthew. All this is admitted. But Justin's citations from the apostolic Memorabilia differ so noticeably both in expression and thought from their parallels in our canonical Gospels that these cannot be regarded as Justin's source. He must have had different narratives before him. And if he did not quote from our canonical Gospels, the inference is fair that they were not then extant, for Justin Martyr was a learned man and well acquainted with the church of his time.

Now it will be admitted by all that Justin's citations from the Gospels differ from the corresponding passages in our canonical writings, but these divergences do not force us to accept the view that our Gospels postdate Justin Martyr. For the freedom which early Christian writers exercised in quoting Scripture, regarding the substance rather than the form, and the absence, in the first half of the second century, of that deep feeling of the canonic dignity of our New Testament writings, which we find in the latter part of the century, and also the existence of other Christian writings

¹ *Die Auffassungszeit der Synoptischen Evangelien. Ein Nachweis aus J. Martyr*, von Ludwig Paul. Leipzig, 1887.

of importance, which had not yet been definitely marked off from our canonic New Testament, may be held to account for the form in which Gospel statements appear in Justin Martyr and his contemporaries.

JOHN.—The literary history of the Fourth Gospel is still discussed along the usual lines, while the experience of an increasing number of believers corroborates its inspiration. Other writers¹ are added to the ranks of those who defend the genuineness and historical character of the Fourth Gospel, and another² also is added to the school of Baur. To one class, the Gospel of John is self-accrediting, as the work of an eye-witness, of a sympathetic and profound believer in Jesus; to the other, it seems a book that is occupied to the end with the anti-Jewish struggle of a post-apostolic age, a book in regard to which the idea can not be entertained that it had an immediate disciple of Jesus as its author. One believes it to be truly historic, the other regards it as manipulating history for a special end, taking up into itself various legends and freely changing the synoptic tradition. One finds the Christ of the three older Gospels in the Gospel of John as well, a Christ whose impress upon the world is evidence of a historic existence; the other finds in the Fourth Gospel a Christ who points quite as plainly toward the Jewish philosoph-

¹ *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, ausgelegt von Dr. Gustav Fr. Wahle. Friedrich Andreas Perthes. Gotha, 1888.

The Pulpit Commentary. The Gospel of Saint John. Introduction and Exposition by Rev. H. P. Reynolds, D.D. Homiletics, by Prof. T. Crosby, D.D. 2 Vols., London, 1888.

² *Das Johannesevangelium untersucht und erklärt von Oscar Holtzmann.* Darmstadt, 1887.

ical schools of Alexandria as He does toward the humble walks of Galilee. To one, the author of the Fourth Gospel wishes to sketch the life-line where Jesus met him, to present the personality of Jesus Christ as that which gives life, and to present it, not in words mechanically reported, but in the language of a heart which consciously possesses the very Saviour whom the eyes once beheld; to the other, the author, writing in the second century, wished to furnish a book for the education of the Church, and wrote under manifold influences of heathen surroundings and Alexandrian philosophy. This latter influence is manifest in the conception of Christ as the incarnate Logos, in the emphasis laid upon truth as the goal of the Christian life, in the mention of scattered children of God, living in the world before the appearance of Christ, and finally in the distinction of a super-sensuous and a sensuous world. The negative critic in question thinks that the greatest loss in the Johannine conception of Christianity is its lack of promises and summons in regard to the moral condition of humanity, and that its greatest merit is the presentation of the blessed experiences of the individual, which are connected with the thought of redemption.

The spiritually receptive student of the Fourth Gospel, who is in quest of life, because conscious of sin, who alone is qualified to judge of the content of a spiritual writing, will ever protest against this sort of hard critical interpretation.

ACTS.—The genesis of our fifth New Testament writing, long, but wrongly regarded as a historical narrative writ-

ten by the author of the third Gospel, was, according to the most recent investigations,¹ as follows:

Soon after the death of Paul, about the year 65 A.D., an unnamed companion composed a history of the apostle. This history appears in our Acts, in the passages where the narrative is in the first person, that is, from chapter xvi, 10 to the close of the book. At the beginning of the second century, a Paulinist, who has been called Luke since about 180 A.D., took this ancient document and reconstructed it in the interest of peace. For there had been a long and disastrous conflict in the Church between the Petrine and Pauline factions, a conflict which broke out on the memorable day in Antioch in 53 A.D., when Paul openly rebuked Peter for his inconsistent conduct in the matter of eating with the Gentiles. In reconstructing the original journal, the editor of the second century suppressed and altered the material before him as seemed best for the accomplishment of the desired end. His book was to neutralize the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. It is to be noticed that the hand which so ruthlessly dissects the Acts, is not raised against the Epistle to the Galatians, but this letter is regarded as the oldest and, historically, the clearest of all the New Testament writings. Thus, while we must see some of our canonical books buried beneath the waves of hostile criticism (or incur the contempt of some who know that their method is the only scientific one), there are others, which even the strongest-hearted of the negative critics do not attack, and these unassailed writings (Galatians, Romans, First and Second Corinthians) contain the entire Gospel.

¹ *Paulus von Damascus bis zum Galaterbrief.* Gustav Volkmar, Zürich, 1887.

THE LETTERS OF PAUL.—The latest writers¹ agree that there were four parties in the Corinthian Church. The watchword: “And I of Christ,” was not the confession of Paul himself, as the Reformers and some in later times have thought, but belonged to a distinct party, which, as well as the other three, falls under the Apostle’s condemnation. But here agreement ends. Was the Christ party called out by the existing divisions, a protest, at first, against sectarianism, but becoming, in the sequel, the most intolerant of all (Ellicott); or did it consist of proud, free-spirited Gentiles, who threw off allegiance to any human teacher (Göbel); or did it consist of ultra-Judaizers whose aim was to impose the Mosaic law upon the Gentile converts (Godet)? Such a party is met with in Jerusalem at the time of the council, whom Paul calls “false brethren.” They were not satisfied with the imposition of the law upon the Jewish converts; the Gentiles also must come under the yoke. It would seem that, if the Christ party were composed of such dangerous men, there would be further references to it in the course of the Epistle.

With regard to the plan of the Epistle, there seems to be sometimes (cf. Godet) too great a solicitude to find a symmetrical structure in it. Renan’s slighting remark that Paul did not possess the patience to make a book, apparently leads one writer (Godet) to exaggerate the sys-

¹ *St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians: with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary.* By Charles J. Ellicott, D.D. London, 1887.

Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. By F. Godet, Edinburgh, 1886.

Der erste Brief Pauli an die Korinther. Von Siegfried Göbel. F. A. Perthes in Gotha, 1887.

tematic character of the Epistle. The questions discussed are arranged in four classes—ecclesiastical, moral, liturgical, and doctrinal, and these are said to "show a rational gradation." But it would seem that this order might be changed, and the moral questions be discussed before the ecclesiastical as appropriately as after; also that the divisions are not very clear, for the New Testament has no ethics that is separable from its religious doctrines. The letters of Paul are indeed letters, and not systematic treatises; and they are letters written by one who was pressed by multitudinous cares and labors.

The latest writer¹ on the Epistle to the Ephesians rejects the hypothesis that the epistle was designed as a circular letter, holding with Meyer that the ancient tradition, as supported by Tertullian, Clement and Irenaeus, is to be allowed more weight than the absence of the words *εἰς Ἐφέσῳ* in the oldest MSS. No clear explanation, however, is offered, to account for the blank in the ancient documents. It is admitted that the epistle was probably designed for other congregations as well as for that of Ephesus, and that Tychicus was to deliver it to them. While holding that the question as to the place of composition is not definitely closed, this writer thinks that the arguments are for Rome rather than Cæsarea. Colossians, Philemon and Philippians² are also referred to the same place.

Writers³ of the past year agree in regarding the Pasto-

¹ Schnedermann, in the *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*. Vierte Abtheilung Neuen Testaments. Nördlingen, 1888.

² Cf. Godet, in *The Expositor* for August, 1887.

³ Cf. Kübel, in the *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*. Nördlingen, 1888. *Kommentar zu den Pastoralbriefen*. Erster Theil: Der

ral Epistles as genuine. It is admitted that these writings differ in some marked particulars from the other letters of Paul. An unwonted emphasis is laid on ecclesiastical offices, and the kind of false doctrine that is opposed is other than that of the early epistles. Differences in style and language are not regarded as furnishing a basis for a valid argument against the genuineness. It is urged (Kölling) that the existing peculiarities exactly correspond to the fact that Paul wrote, not to Christians in general, as in other epistles, but to a trained leader. The prominence of ecclesiasticism is held to be in keeping with what is known of the close of the Apostolic Age. "In proportion as the extraordinary gifts of primitive times cease, the offices in the church increase in importance and influence, and the principal gift—that of teaching—which survived all the rest, came to be more and more closely identified with the office of the regular ministry" (Godet). The errors against which the Apostle protests in these letters are regarded (Kübel, Godet,) as Jewish in character rather than Gnostic, errors akin to those found in the Colossian Church, but of a more advanced type. One writer (Kübel), though defending the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, thinks it possible that, in their present form, they come, not directly from Paul, but from one who was intimately acquainted with Paul and Timothy and Titus. To this editor may be ascribed the peculiar coloring of language and style, and the tendency to episcopacy.

zweite Brief an Timotheus. Von Dr. Karl Knoke. Göttingen, 1887.
Godet, in *The Expositor* for January, 1888. *Der erste Brief Pauli an Timotheus.* Von Heinrich Kölling. Zweiter Theil, Die Auslegung. Berlin, 1887.

But with this agreement regarding genuineness there is still a wide difference of opinion touching the later career of the Apostle. The hypothesis of a release and second imprisonment is strongly supported, and yet an attempt has recently been made (Knoke) to demonstrate that Second Timothy was written during the imprisonment from 61 to 63 A. D. It is held to be inherently improbable that Paul would have ventured a second time into the lion's mouth, and the historical evidence, that of the early church, is discredited. The testimony of Clement would prove too much; the witness of Eusebius rests upon the untrustworthy Dionysius, and upon a misinterpretation of II Timothy iv, 16, while the testimony of the Muratorian Canon is only proof that a legend was founded upon Rom. iv, 24. It is then argued that the Acts, especially Paul's address at Miletus (xx, 25-28) and the revelation made to him at Jerusalem (xxiii, 11), make the impression that their author knew nothing of a release and second imprisonment.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES AND HEBREWS.—The theory that the “brothers” of Jesus were not really brothers but only cousins, on the mother’s side, is represented in one of the latest exegetical volumes from the German press, in which the author of the Epistle of James is identified with the son of Alphæus, who belonged to the Twelve. The writer holds that the Epistle was composed between 44 and 52 A. D., and is consequently the earliest portion of the New Testament. It must have been composed, it is said,

¹ *Kurzgefasster Kommentar.* Vierte Abtheilung. Nördlingen, 1888.

before the great question arose which was discussed at the Council of Jerusalem, since it contains no reference to it.

The investigation of the literary origin of the Epistles of Peter is still far from arriving at satisfactory results. The writers¹ of the past year agree that the First Epistle was addressed to Gentile Christians, as against Weiss, who holds that the readers were converts from the Jews. Both put the composition of the letter between 60 and 70 A. D. (Burger 63–64 A. D. Usteri 65–70 A. D.), while Weiss puts it early in the sixth decade before Paul's great work in Asia Minor. But it is not proven that Jewish-Christian congregations were established in Asia Minor before Paul's time. Against the hypothesis that the Epistle was written in the second century are urged (Usteri) the expectation of the Parousia, the simplicity of the charismatic life, and the primitive character of ecclesiastical organization—the position of the bishops being represented as one of unselfish service rather than of especial dignity. The same writer (Usteri), while holding the essential genuineness of the Epistle, favors the view that it did not come directly from the hand of Peter. The church tradition concerning Peter's interpreter, and also the absence of personal references to the Apostle's condition, are thought to be against a direct composition by Peter. The actual writer of the letter is found in Silvanus (v. 12). The words, "I have written unto you by Silvanus," while they might refer to the bearer of the letter, might refer equally well to Silvanus as the composer. There is no objection to supposing that Sil-

¹ Burger, in the *Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Wissenschaftlicher und Praktischer Kommentar über den Ersten Petrusbrief*. Von Joh. M. Usteri. Zürich, 1887.

vanus wrote after Peter's death, which would account for the absence of references to his condition. Silvanus, even in this case, was legitimated as the authentic interpreter of the Petrine spirit. While this view is attractive, it is admitted that conclusive arguments are wanting against Peter's immediate authorship.

The "elect lady" of John's second letter has recently¹ been understood to refer to a church, not to an individual woman. This is supported by the abrupt change from the singular to the plural, as when John says in one sentence:

"I beseech *thee*, lady," and in another: "This is the commandment, even as *ye* heard from the beginning." *Kυρία* corresponds to *Κύριος*, as, in the Apocalypse, *νύμφη* corresponds to *νύμφιος*. The common Biblical usage of the word "wife" to denote the people of the Lord is also to be noted. A parallel to the use of *Kυρία* for a single church is found 1 Peter v. 13: "She that is in Babylon, elect together with you."

Recent studies² of the origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews show the old differences of view. It is held, on the one hand, that the Epistle was not addressed to Palestinian Jewish-Christians (Kübel). The title in and of itself does not justify this narrow construction. The references to the temple are as natural on the lips of Jews from abroad as they are on the lips of the Palestinians. The use of the Septuagint and of the Greek language points rather to readers of the Dispersion than to the Jews of the

¹ Cf. Luthardt, in the *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*, 1888.

² Cf. Kübel, in the *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*. Prof. A. B. Bruce, in *The Expositor* for March, 1888. Prof. F. Godet, in *The Expositor* for April, 1888.

Aramaic-speaking home-land. The references to persecutions and to the falling away are also regarded as indicating a circle of readers outside of Palestine. On the other hand, it is argued (Godet) that the Epistle has in view Jewish-Christian congregations only, and that there were none such outside of Palestine. Also that the extreme conservatism manifested among the readers points to their close proximity to the temple, and that the personal and specific notices of the Epistle (Bruce) exclude the view that it was addressed to the Jewish-Christians in general.

The author is held to have been Silas (Godet) or Barnabas (Kübel.) In speaking of the author, attention is called to the fact (Godet) that, while in the teaching of Paul the redemptive work of Christ centers in the cross, in the Epistle to the Hebrews it is carried on in the heavenly Sanetuary. These are distinct points of view. In rejecting the Pauline authorship the observation of Thiersch is cited: "If it should be found that a noble picture, which had been attributed to Raphael, was not by that artist, there would not be one masterpiece the less, but one great master the more." With a good degree of unanimity the date of composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews is put between 65 and 70 A.D. The reference to Timothy's release is used in this connection (Godet), as pointing to the year 66 A.D., when, after the death of Paul, he is supposed to have been set at liberty.

THE APOCALYPSE. The theory of the Apocalypse which was criticized in vol. v of *Current Discussions* has not met with much favor.¹ One recent writer² has apparently adopted

¹ Cf. Prof. C. A. Briggs, in *The Presbyterian Review* for January, 1888. ² *L'Origine de l'Apocalypse de Saint Jean.* Paris, 1887.

the principle of that theory, for while the Apocalypse as a whole is regarded as a Christian production, written toward the close of the first century, possibly by John, certain sections, four in all (xi, 1–13; xii, 1–9; xiii, 1–7, 11–18), are assigned to the period 68–70 A.D., and are considered as purely Jewish. In another quarter¹ the Johannean authorship is defended, but at the same time it is thought that the hand of a literary editor must be recognized either in the Apocalypse, or in the other Johannean writings, or in both, and this because of differences in language between the Gospel and Epistles, on the one hand, and the Apocalypse on the other.

With regard to the date of composition, the year 68 or 69 A.D. is fixed upon, but the testimony of the early church is significantly passed over.

As to the construction of the book it is denied that it must be regarded either as chronological or synchronistic. Either method of interpretation, strictly carried out, involves us in the greatest embarrassment. The constructive principle of the book is telic. The visions are partly chronological and partly synchronistic.

¹ Kübel, in the *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*.

CHAPTER II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT.

A careful and interesting investigation¹ in this department of study is that of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament, a cursive, No. 69. The history of this document is constructed on the basis of its remarkable relation to a MS. of the Greek Psalter, which is in the library of Caius College, Cambridge. It is evident from the striking peculiarities which the two MSS. have in common that the same hand wrote both. The history of the Caius Psalter is ingeniously constructed. A double leaf of vellum, which once formed part of a monk's account-book and which is pasted over the board cover furnishes valuable data. The water-mark in the paper of the Leicester Codex is found to resemble the heraldic figure of Ancona, where the earliest known Italian paper was manufactured. The arrangement in quires and the handwriting are also thought to point toward Italy. The conclusion regarding the English history of the Caius Psalter is that it received its present binding in the Franciscan convent at Cambridge, and the presumption is that the companion volume, the Leicester Codex, was the property of the same convent. Prior to this, it is thought to have been

¹ *The Origin of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament.* By J. Rendell Harris. London, 1887.

in Italy, where, indeed, it was written, and whence it was sent unbound to England.

An exceedingly interesting palimpsest in the Vatican (Codex Vaticanus Graecus 2061) has been carefully investigated¹ for the first time. This MS. contains 316 leaves, which are now occupied with the sermons of Gregory of Nazianzen, copied about the beginning of the eleventh century by a priest named Basil. Underneath these sermons fragments of various writings are found some of which are of great interest. Parts of the geography of Strabo have been deciphered. These are in the uncial letters, and are supposed to belong to the ninth century. Fifty-six leaves once contained sermons some of which were by Gregory of Nazianzen. These also belong to the ninth century. It appears that, in this case, Basil employed parchment which from one to two hundred years earlier had been used for the sermons of the same illustrious Gregory. Seven leaves contain a lectionary of the eighth century in uncial letters. Thirty-nine leaves, also from the eighth century, contain part of a lectionary of the Gospels. Finally, there are twenty-one leaves of especially fine parchment, which contain fragments of the Acts, II Peter, the Epistles of John, eleven of the Pauline Epistles, and of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The original writing of these leaves was without breathings and accents, and had no marks of punctuation save the high point. The titles of the books are the simplest. These twenty-one leaves are thought to be as old as the fifth century, and

¹ By Abbé Pierre Batiffol. Results not yet published. Above data from Dr. C. R. Gregory's minute description in the *Theologisches Litteraturblatt*, Sept. 23, 1887.

possibly as old as the fourth (Dr. Gregory). They may be fragments of one of the fifty MSS., which Constantine ordered to be prepared for the churches of his new capital. Thus they take their place among the most ancient MSS. of the New Testament.

As preliminary to a study of the development of the Latin Bible, critical attention has been given¹ to the Latin versions that existed in the times prior to Jerome. Three types of text are distinguished. The oldest is that of the Latin Bible, of which we have clear traces in Tertullian and Cyprian. The second is the text which was used by Augustine, and by him called *Itala*. The third is the text which Jerome called the *Vulgata*.

Attention² is called to the fact that the text of the *Apocalypse*, in spite of the small number of MSS., and in spite of the treatment which it has received in printed editions, especially in that of Erasmus, is nevertheless well established. The three great editions of the Greek New Testament.—Tregelles, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort—are almost agreed as to the text of the *Apocalypse*. There are one hundred and thirty-eight passages in which one of these editions stands alone, but the differences of reading are in most cases unimportant grammatical variations. Westcott and Hort have but two peculiar words, Tischendorf five.

¹ *Der Galaterbrief im altlateinischen Text als Grundlage für einen textkritischen Apparat der Vetus Latina.* Dr. Fr. Zimmer. Königsberg, 1887.

² Cf. Dr. Caspar René Gregory in the *Theologisches Litteraturblatt* for Nov. 4, 1888.

CHAPTER III.

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY.

The undying interest of Christian nations in the land of Palestine is manifest in the constant succession of books, small and great, which are devoted to its minute study. The past forty-seven years, the period since the publication of Dr. Robinson's Biblical Researches in Palestine, have produced a literature treating of the Holy Land, which is wholly without parallel among the writings that treat of any other country. It is more copious, more exact, and more sympathetic. In spite of the obstacles which have been thrown in the way by a fanatical government and an uncivilized people, the land has been studied from Moab to the sea, and from Lebanon to the desert. Its ruins have been photographed, its ancient boundaries traced, its fauna and flora described, and its people have been closely observed. Yet the theme is not exhausted. Of the last investigations¹ it can hardly be said that they are the best. The finest talent for observation and the most graphic pen can not give to the conclusions of a transient tourist (Geikie) the value that belongs to the words of one who, with all the time which could be desired at his disposal,

¹ *The Holy Land and the Bible.* By Cunningham Geikie. New York, 1888.

Palestine in the Time of Christ. By Edmond Stapfer. Third edition, carefully revised, 1887.

has studied every point from different sides. The bane of most books of travel is premature generalization.

The French student of New Testament History (Stapfer) draws his information chiefly from the Talmuds. They furnish the most ample and circumstantial data regarding the life of the Jews in the first century. But when they are compared with the Gospels, as literature, it bewilders the imagination to think that both were produced in Palestine at about the same time. The best treatise of the Mishnah is separated by a deep gulf from the precepts of Gospel morality. Having studied Judaism with full sympathy, anxious to find that it approached the New Testament more nearly than is generally supposed, the writer finds no historical confirmation for such statements as that "the noble and gentle Hillel was the elder brother of Jesus." He was a casuist like the other rabbis, and the pleasant fiction of his liberalism must be abandoned. This is also the view of a recent American scholar.¹ "Hillel never became a reformer. He changed nothing. All he did was to carry out more fully the system of tradition taught by the Pharisees, he gave himself no trouble as to the religious state of the nation at large, and did nothing whatever to awaken religious life." But while the French writer mentioned above places the Talmuds at a vast remove from the Gospels, regarded from a literary and moral point of view, he uses the Gospel narrative in a somewhat loose and arbitrary fashion. Because there was a hamlet called Bethlehem near to Nazareth, it is asked whether Jesus may not have been born in this very village,

¹ *The Talmud. What it is.* By Bernhard Pick, Ph.D. J. B. Alden, Publisher, N. Y., 1887.

as He is styled "the Nazarene." In later times His birth-place may have been confounded with Bethlehem Ephratah in Judea, the cradle of the family of David, where according to tradition, Messiah was to be born.

It seems also to require rather rough handling of the Gospel narrative as history to bring out of it the conclusion that the demoniacs, of whom it speaks, were poor madmen whose brain had been set on fire, who had taken the hallucinations of their own visions as realities, and whose heads had been turned by religious fanaticism. The land of Palestine and the labors of other investigators are employed as sources in a most unsatisfactory way. Capernaum is found to be equi-distant from Gadara, Caesarea Philippi, Tyre and Sidon. Jacob's well is identified with a shallow pool at Sichem. Jericho is on the banks of the Jordan. The Samaritans, who thirty years ago numbered one hundred and fifty, have now entirely disappeared. The Sanhedrim had the legal right to sentence and execute Jesus, and they simply dealt in flattery when they said to Pilate: "It is not lawful for us to put any one to death."

The historical value of the Talmuds is overrated, as compared with the historical value of the Gospel narrative. The inferences from that source are not always sober. It is argued that Jesus could not speak Greek because the Talmud says: "He who teaches his son Greek is accursed like him who keeps pigs."

It seems to be taken for granted that all the common people, even in those troublous times, lived their lives in accordance with the multitudinous and bewildering requirements of the rabbinical schools, and it is forgotten

that the Man in question rejected most emphatically the traditions and precepts of these schools.

With regard to the religious condition of the Jews of the first century, it is doubtless truly said that the great lack, even among earnest and thoughtful men, was conviction of sin. The Jews did not know what sin is. The two ideas in the teaching of Jesus which were unquestionably original, are said to be the idea of salvation through faith and the idea of a spiritual kingdom of Messiah. These ideas He derived, above all, from his own inner consciousness, and we are led to say that the new thing in the first century was not so much the teaching of Jesus, as Jesus himself.

No important studies in the life of Christ claim attention in this sixth volume of *Current Discussions*. A Catholic work¹ is approaching completion, but it can hardly be said to add to the valuable literature of the subject. It is a ponderous, often fanciful, commentary on the four Gospels, betraying little acquaintance with the critical works of modern times and ignoring the ancient sources of illustration.

A recent study² of *The Divine Man from the Nativity to the Temptation* emphasize, by antithesis, the importance of critical method and soberness in exegesis.

The startling contrast between the utterances of holy men, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, and men who spake out of the imaginations of their own

¹ *Leben Jesu*. Von Dr. Joseph Grimm. Vierter Band. 1887. Regensburg.

² *The Divine Man from the Nativity to the Temptation*. By Geo. Dana Boardman. N. Y., 1887.

hearts, is again presented in a little volume of compilations from the Apocryphal Gospels.¹ Enough of the whole mass of apocryphal literature is given to afford a fair idea of the scope of these thoroughly superstitious, and for the greater part, puerile writings. Their only historical value is to give a sad picture of how Christians (mostly heretical), between the second and seventh centuries, could think of Jesus and Mary and the spirit world. Their ideas of the humanity and divinity of Jesus are wholly false. Yet it may be profitable to read these ancient "Gospels" in order the better to appreciate the words of the inspired evangelists.

¹ *The Life of Jesus according to extra-canonical Sources.* By Bernhard Pick, Ph. D. J. B. Alden, N. Y., 1887.

CHAPTER IV.

NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS.

What has recently been said¹ of the gains of modern English exegesis is equally true of modern exegesis in general, not excluding that of the Roman Catholic Church, though the advance here is notably less than among Protestants. As compared with the exegesis of earlier centuries, that of our own is more rigidly defined. The relevant has been separated from the irrelevant, to the great gain of the science and the edification of the reader. Then the critical apparatus has been carried far toward perfection, and the number of scholars who are able to read the Bible languages and their cognates, critically, has been greatly increased. The number of candidates for the ministry who think they can dispense with the Hebrew and the Greek seems to be diminishing. Many who have not had a classical education are solicitous of gaining some knowledge of the tongues in which the Old Testament and the New were written. This is the case in England and in our own country.

In consequence of this tendency various primers of New Testament Greek have been prepared.² These will ren-

¹ Cf. F. W. Farrar, in *The Expositor* for Jan., 1888.

² *A Primer of New Testament Greek.* By Edward Miller, M. A. Oxford, 1888.

der good service, though sometimes in danger of fostering the idea that a profitable acquaintance with New Testament Greek, by which is meant a fair critical knowledge, is the acquisition of a few months.

With this growing interest in the study of the Bible tongues, there has been developed an independence of judgment not found in earlier exegesis. This is even more conspicuous in America and in continental lands than in England. The work of the American Revision Committee, for instance, is the index of a more independent exegetical science than is that of the English Committee. Great benefit has resulted to modern exegesis from a broader study of the Bible as a whole. It may also be added that the growth of a more rational theory of inspiration is one of the gains of modern exegesis.

Our starting point in the survey of the last year's exegetical productions is the creditable work done in our own land.¹ The cast of our work in this department is, and has always been, decidedly practical and popular, but some of it at least is well worthy to be called scientific. The chief American contribution of the year (Broadus) does not propose to be undenominational, and assuredly is not, as may easily be seen in the space given to the subject of baptism. It is implied that there has been less sincerity among those who have rejected immersion than among Baptists. "Strongly biased and ingenious minds

¹ *An American Commentary on the New Testament. Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew.* By John A. Broadus, D. D., LL. D. Philadelphia. American Baptist Publ. Soc., 1420 Chestnut Street, 1887. *People's Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew.* By Edwin W. Rice, D. D. Philadelphia. The American Sunday School Union, 1887.

can always cast some apparent doubt over the meaning of the plainest words." "In the course of time many Protestants came to perceive that it was very awkward to rest their practice in this respect on the authority of the Church of Rome, and being accustomed and attached to the practice they very naturally sought countenance for it in Scripture." In the course of his argument the writer refers to the "Didaché" and assigns it, (with its rather unpleasant testimony) to the latter half of the second century. To this late date, however, many important critics are opposed. It is held that there are no passages in the New Testament in which the ordinary meaning of *βαπτιζειν* is not both possible and appropriate. Even in regard to those cases in which immersion would seem to have been inconvenient and unlikely, we must say that "a due consideration of Jewish scrupulosity and known customs makes the rite not only possible but natural enough." But how does a "due consideration of Jewish scrupulosity and known customs" apply to the Gentile jailor of Philippi (Acts xvi, 23)? It is hardly probable that he had a tank in readiness, and certainly Paul was the last man who would lay great emphasis on the particular method of a purely symbolical act.

In both of the recent works referred to there is unexpected inconsistency and arbitrariness in the interpretation of the narrative of our Lord's temptation. "In the three signal and final temptations (Broadus) it seems to be distinctly declared that Satan appeared in bodily form and with actually spoken words, and this fitted the scene for distinct and impression descriptive. To make it a mere vision is without the slightest warrant. And while it is

possible to regard the history as merely a vivid description of a series of internal temptations, it does no small violence to the language and the entire color of the narrative." Of the third temptation it is said, "It is best to understand a sort of vision. It may certainly be conceived that Satan had the power, while Jesus looked round from the mountain-top, to cause such a view to pass before his eyes." It is said (Rice) that there may have been either a voluntary or miraculous extension of vision, or that Jesus may have seen a part of the kingdoms of the world with the natural eye and the rest with the mind's eye, as Satan described it to Him. But the view that the temptation could be "in thought" is rejected with disdain. "The devil is no fool; his suggested temptations are not transparent absurdities." It is admitted (Broadus) that during the forty days our Lord was tempted by suggestions to His mind, as we are, and then, at the close of the forty days, it is held that the temptation was from a visible devil in audible words. But our narrative gives no indication of two *kinds* of temptation.

While insisting upon the literal and objective character of the first and second temptations, it is admitted by these writers that in the third temptation there was "a sort of vision." With the exception of an insignificant fraction of the earth which could be seen with the eye of flesh, the vision of the kingdoms of the world is admitted to have been internal (Broadus). But if the vision from the mountain top was internal, so may that on the temple have been internal. The theory breaks down at this point. It is said that it does no small violence to the language and the entire color of the narrative to regard the history as merely

a vivid description of a series of internal temptations. Attention is called to the correspondence of the two expressions, ‘the devil leaves him—angels came and ministered to him.’ The second clause is taken literally, therefore the first should be. But Luke says, in the narrative of the betrayal, that Satan entered into Judas, and in the next sentence says that Judas went away. Now of course Judas’ going away was visible, therefore Satan’s entering into him must have been visible also. We shrink from the results of such reasoning. It does not appear why so much earnestness should be manifested in proving that the Satan of the wilderness was visible and audible. From that day to this the disciples of Jesus have been grievously tempted, but not by a visible and audible Satan. Further, it is declared that Jesus was tempted in all points as are His followers.

The conception of a visible Satan walking with Jesus through the streets of Jerusalem and with Him climbing to the pinnacle of the temple; the conception of a visible Satan conducting Jesus across the country from Jerusalem to Hermon, or to some other exceedingly high mountain, and making the ascent with Him (unless, indeed, Satan is supposed to have borne Jesus through the air in a wholly magic fashion), seems to belong rather among the stories of the Koran than in the spiritual Gospel of Jesus Christ.

One feature of this recent work (Broadus) is the frank admission of discrepancies in details. For instance, Matthew and Mark differ in their report of Christ’s address to the Twelve on sending them out. According to Matthew they are not to procure a staff, according to Mark they may carry one. It is not felt that such variations affect

the inspired character of the book. In some points the exegesis will not be regarded as satisfactory. One or two of these may be mentioned. It is said that Jesus purposely employs harsh language which will develop the faith and humility of the Tyro-Phoenician woman. The language is apologized for by saying that the "Gentiles around were accustomed to this!" as though the fact that they were accustomed to insults at all justified one in insulting them. But it is not correct to say that calling a person a dog was, in the time of Jesus, simply a "harsh expression." It was a term of contempt and insult. It is morally inconceivable that Jesus endorsed the bitter feeling which the Jews cherished toward the Gentiles. Nor is there ground for saying that He used harsh language as a means of developing faith and humility. This woman showed from the first a remarkable faith, and the narrative gives no indication that there was in her a lack of humility. Furthermore, it was not the way with Jesus to seek to develop faith by the use of "harsh" epithets, not to apply a stronger designation than this to the language in question. Justice is not done to the explanation of Weiss, which, though not wholly satisfactory, contains the best solution of the problem.

The most serious difficulty in the interpretation of the Eschatological Discourse is the supposition that the events of xxiv, 29-31, refer both to the destruction of Jerusalem and to the end of the age. The troublesome word "immediately" (Mt. xxiv, 29) is explained by a recent writer¹ as referring rather to the fact of fulfilment than to the

¹ Cf. Professor Charles A. Briggs, in *The Presbyterian Review* for Jan., 1888.

time of the same. The event is near in the prophetic sense, that is, it is certain, but the time is uncertain. This interpretation is based upon the Old Testament usage of the word near.

Our American commentator on Matthew assumes an informal session of the Sanhedrim, at which Jesus was sentenced, and a formal session, at which He was tried and by which He was sent to Pilate. This is treated as a settled question. But if it is indeed settled, the settlement is against two sessions and sentences rather than for them. (Cf. Weiss' *Leben Jesu*, Band 2, Seite 558). The passage in Mt. xxvii, 1–2, speaks of a morning session of the chief priest and elders, but it contains no suggestion of a trial or a sentence. They took counsel against Jesus, to put Him to death. But taking counsel against a man is not trying him. It is altogether probable that the morning counsel concerned the best method of securing from the Roman power the execution of the sentence already pronounced by the Sanhedrim.

The past year has not added to the literature on the Gospel according to Mark, save in the way of semi-homiletical study.¹ This has been of a high order, full of keen insight into human nature and pervaded by devout feeling. In speaking of the temptation, attention is called to the fact that the place of the temptation in the Gospel narrative is psychologically confirmed. "High places are dizzy, and especially when one has just attained them; and therefore it was when the voice of the herald and the Voice from the heavens were blended in acclaim, that the Evil

¹ *The Gospel according to St. Mark.* By Rev. G. A. Chadwick, Dean of Armagh, New York, 1888.

One tried all his arts." This is an incidental corroboration of the historical value of the account of our Lord's temptation. The fact that Jesus did not experience hunger till after forty days is regarded as a measure of the "remorseless urgency of Satan." The miracles of Christ seem to be treated rather from a dogmatic than an exegetical standpoint. "They are wrought," it is said, "without any reference whatever to a superior will." "Christ's power is inherent, it is self-possessed." This view is not supported by the narrative. Before Jesus called Lazarus forth from the tomb, He said, "Father, I thank thee that thou heardest me." In what? Naturally in the request that Lazarus might be restored. The same attitude of Jesus toward the Father is contained in the "sighing," with eyes turned toward heaven, on the occasion of the healing of the deaf and dumb man. When Peter was using his sword in Gethsemane, Jesus said, "Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?" And then, in a comprehensive passage, Jesus says, "If I by the finger of God cast out devils, etc." In all these cases there is a plain reference to a superior will—an exegetical result which is supported by the New Testament teaching in regard to the humanity of Jesus.

Recent exegetical studies¹ of the Gospel according to John are more theological and philosophical than philo-

¹ *Das Gespräch Jesu mit der Samariterin.* Von F. L. Steimayer. Berlin, 1887.

Das Evangelium nach Johannis ausgelegt. Von Dr. Gustav Fr. Wahle. Gotha, F. A. Perthes, 1888.

The Pulpit Commentary. The Gospel of St. John. Rev. H. R. Reynolds, D.D. London, 1888.

logical. Neither the English nor the German work can be regarded as reaching the highest level of excellence in the department of exegesis. Neither is deserving of the highest praise for the grammatical accuracy of its interpretation, nor for the breadth of its Biblical knowledge. The early pages of the English work furnish exegesis of the following order. The two imperfect verses in John i, 4, “In him was life, and the life was the light of men,” “assert what was in the beginning and what can never cease to be.” But an imperfect tense, in and of itself, can never make such an assertion as this. And, further, the context is against the reference of the imperfect to the beginning in eternity. “The life *was* the light of men” implies the existence of men. It is not said that it was designed to fulfil that end in coming ages.

Again, the limits of the imperfect are overstepped when it is said that the statement, “The true light was coming into the world” is equivalent to this, “The light was *ever* coming into the world.” “Is become,” or, “hath become” (i, 15), is held equal to “hath been in mighty activity.”

A thought is imported into the text when it is said that John the Baptist is referred to (i, 6), in his representative character rather than his historical position. But it was the historical John the Baptist who was thought of for a time as being possibly the expected Messiah, not John in his “representative character.”

The exegesis of the German work (Wahle) (perhaps its lower level) may be seen in its explanation of John vi, 19. The fear of the disciples, it is said, can only have come from the fact that they saw the appearance wandering hither and thither upon the shore, waiting for them, while

they in the mean time were unable to explain who it was. We are asked to believe that $\pi\varepsilon\rho\iota\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$ means a walking back and forth, and that $\nu\pi\lambda\tau\hat{\eta}\varsigma\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$ was a natural expression for the author to use when he meant that the appearance was upon the shore. It would seem, moreover, as though the disciples would have rejoiced, had they thought that the man was on the shore, for in that case they would realize that their perilous voyage was nearly over, and the fact that the man was apparently waiting for them would be reassuring rather than terrifying. It is admitted that the narratives of Matthew and Mark speak plainly of a walking on the sea, but the narratives are supposed to have suffered at the hands of men. This explanation seems to be an unnecessary concession to the demands of unbelieving critics.

The English and German writers differ as to the date of the Last Supper, the former holding that it was on the 13th of Nisan, and bringing the language of the Synoptists into harmony with this by the hypothesis that when they say "the first day of unleavened bread" they use these words in their popular, not their legal, sense; and the latter holding that it was on the 14th of Nisan, according to John as well as the Synoptists. A division is to be made in the 13th chapter of John at the 32d verse, this and the preceding verses belonging to the night of the 13th of Nisan, and what follows belonging to the night of the 14th. The grounds of support for this view are (1) the difficulty of putting all the events from John xiii, 1, into a part of a single night; (2) the psychological improbability that Judas, so soon after Jesus had unmasked him and filled his heart with anger, would have chosen a kiss as the

sign by which he would betray Jesus; (3) the ease with which Judas makes the preparations for the arrest of Jesus, and (4) the discourse concerning the vine (xv, 1), which probably had its occasion in the Passover feast itself, and so would belong to the night of the 14th of Nisan.

It is worthy of remark in this connection that the latest American writer on Matthew, and the latest German commentator on John agree in adopting the view that Annas and Caiaphas occupied the same palace. The German writer finds support in the fact that, while Jesus was before Annas, the officers made a fire in the court, which they would not have done, if they had expected to lead Jesus away soon to another building.

The most important recent study in the Book of Acts is an investigation¹ of the thirteen addresses of Paul. Luke is regarded as the author of the Acts, and the passages in which the narrative proceeds in the first person are held to be out of Luke's own experience as a companion of Paul. Luke as an author combined conscientiousness in investigation, artistic perceptive power, and genius for portrayal. The addresses of Paul are not free compositions by Luke, neither are they verbatim reports. Their brevity, language and style forbid this. But they are artistic reproductions of Paul's discourses, faithfully historical in their substance, but bearing, in their form, the impress of Luke's mind. It is held that there are three constructive principles in the Acts, being respectively, religious, theological, and political. The religious motive is to show the

¹ *Die Paulinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte.* Historisch-grammatisch und biblisch-theologisch ausgelegt. Von Dr. Fr. Bethge. Göttingen, 1887.

guidance and protection of God in the spread of the Christian religion from Jerusalem to Rome, and is most manifest in the speech made during the storm at sea.

The theological motive is the demonstration of the hardening of Israel in spite of missionary work, and the formation of a specifically Gentile Church. This motive is most manifest in the speech before Agrippa and in the closing addresses in Rome, where reference is made to the future of the Gentile Church. The political motive is seen in the representation of Christianity as the true religion of Israel in order to gain the protection of a *religio licita* before the Roman bar. It is manifest in the speeches before the Sanhedrim, before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa.

Among recent suggestive notes on the Acts¹ are those on chapt. ii, 44–45 and 47. A very important modification of the idea of community of goods is obtained by observing the force of the imperfect. The believers “kept selling” their possessions and “kept distributing,” according as any man had need. Private property was retained, but subject to the brother’s need. The suggestion is also made that the verb in chapt. ii, 47, in view of the Apostle’s words in ii, 40, be rendered as a middle. “The Lord added to them day by day those who were saving themselves.”

Investigation of the Pauline Epistles occupies a relatively large place in the exegesis of the past year.

The celebrated passage in I Thessalonians, regarding the man of sin and the power that restrains, has received an explanation somewhat new.² The lawlessness spoken of

¹ Cf. *The Expositor*, for May, 1888.

² Cf. *Neutestamentliche Schriften griechisch mit kurzer Erklärung*. Heft I. *Die Briefe Pauli an die Thessalonicher*. S. Göbel. Gotha, Fr. A. Perthes, 1887.

is understood to be a designed enmity against all divinely established law and order, such enmity as the Apostle everywhere saw in the unbridled and unbelieving world of the Roman Empire, like a glimmering fire beneath the ashes. The restraining power is the moral régime of the state, and “he that restrains” is a personal bearer and representative of the same, yet (and here the ordinary view is abandoned) not an earthly person, as the reigning emperor Claudius, but a heavenly one, according to the analogy of Daniel’s prophecy (chapt. x), in which the passage in Thessalonians has its roots. This heavenly person is the angel-prince who resists and holds in check the spirit of the world-kingdom which is hostile to God. To him the moral order still prevailing in the Roman Kingdom is traced.

The letters to the Corinthian Church occupy the place of honor among recent exegetical works.¹ They are still “weighty and strong.” There is a decided difference of opinion between the English and French writers regarding the value of Westcott and Hort’s text of the First Epistle. The former (Ellicott) regards it as possessing the highest

¹ *St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians.* By Charles J. Ellicott, D.D. London, 1887.

Commentary on St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians. By F. Godet. Edinburgh, 1886-7.

Das zweite Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus an die Korinther, erklärt von Dr. C. F. Georg Heinrici. Berlin, 1887.

Der erste Brief Pauli an die Korinther. Von S. Göbel. Gotha, 1887.

Der zweite Brief Pauli an die Korinther. Von S. Göbel. Gotha, 1887. Published by Fr. A. Perthes.

A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. By Thomas Charles Edwards. See. Ed., N. Y., 1886.

worth, while the latter (Godet) concludes from the twenty-seven most important variants, that the method of criticism which attempts to decide between readings by means of external authorities alone is absolutely erroneous, and that it is erroneous to hold by any one of the three types of text to the neglect of the other two. The English writer gives great honor to the ancient Greek expositors, generously saying that their interpretations form the backbone of his work, while the French writer moves rather among the expositors of this century.

The question is still debated whether Paul included all Christians in his salutation at the beginning of the First Epistle, or simply the Corinthian Church. Both English writers take the former view with Chrysostom, while the French critic refers the salutation to the Church at Corinth alone. As to the origin of the words in chapter ii, 9,

“Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not,
And which entered not into the heart of man,
Whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him,”

these four latest writers are agreed that Isaiah Ixiv, 4, in combination with one or more other passages, is the source from which they are drawn. The citation is free from memory. Thus the view of Origen, that the passage is from the Apocalypse of Elias, and the view of Meyer and Weiss, that it is from an apocryphal book but quoted as from a canonical writing, are both abandoned. There is the same disagreement as ever regarding the passage (ii, 13), which speaks of “combining spiritual things with spiritual words” (Am. Rev.). One writer thinks of spiritual truth expressed in spiritual form (Ellicott); another, of a symmetrical presentation of Christian truth (Edwards);

and yet others regard the words as conveying the general fact that Paul adapted or applied his spiritual truth only to those who were fitted to receive it (Godet, Göbel). He did not cast pearls before swine. The judgment of the sinner who is delivered to Satan for destruction of the flesh (I Cor. v, 5) is, in a measure, understood alike by these recent writers. They agree that the apostolic act gave the sinner over to physical suffering, the cases of Ananias, Simon, Elymas and Job being analogous. But they differ in regard to the termination of the suffering, some holding that death was only a possible outcome (Ell. Edw.), while others regard death as the manifest judgment inflicted by Paul (Godet, Göbel). Yet they do not think of death as sudden; time is left to the sinner for repentance. The majority of these latest students agree that the expression, "to deliver to Satan," means excommunication from the Church. The mysterious veiling of women "on account of the angels" (I Cor. xi, 10) is not yet satisfactorily explained. The strongest support, however, seems to be furnished for the view that Paul had in mind the presence of angels at the worship of Christians. (Ellicott, Godet). It is easy to go beyond what is needful for the exegesis, in presenting this view, and to speculate as one writer does (Godet), how the pain and shame felt by these invisible witnesses would spread a sombre shade over the serenity of the worship. Such speculations weaken the view. Another writer (Göbel) thinks that the angels are referred to as instruments of the divine working, and that decorum on their account is not essentially different from decorum on account of God himself. This has perhaps better support than the view that the angels are men-

tioned as examples to the women of holy creatures that keep their place of subordination (Edwards). Regarding the divers kinds of tongues that were heard in the Corinthian Church (I Cor. xii, 10) and their relation to the Pentecostal gift it would perhaps be unreasonable to expect any perfectly satisfactory explanation. The latest writers are certainly divided in opinion. On the one hand, it is thought that we may clearly recognize in the New Testament two general forms of the mysterious gift of tongues: (1) the higher, that of speaking in languages known to the hearers, but unknown to the speakers, of which the only certainly recorded instance is in the second chapter of Acts, and (2) the lower and more common form, showing itself probably in many different kinds of manifestations. Such was the phenomenon in the Corinthian Church (Ellicott). But by what right can we call the Pentecostal gift "higher" than that enjoyed by the Corinthians, for the possession of which Paul himself gave thanks? There would seem to be no inherent reason why the speaking in foreign tongues should be "higher" than ecstatic utterance. It is noticeable that the Holy Spirit has not preserved for us a specimen of either kind of speech, if, indeed, there were two distinct kinds. It is quite doubtful also whether we ought to speak of the Pentecostal gift as unique, for the speaking at Pentecost seems to have been repeated in the house of Cornelius at Cæsarea (Acts x, 46; xi, 15). On the other hand, over against the recognition of two kinds of tongues, it is held that the New Testament knows of but one gift of tongues (Godet). The Pentecostal speaking differed from the Corinthian only in degree. But, what was the language in general?

The answer of Godet is somewhat uncertain. "It was an extraordinary language of which we can no longer form an idea;" "it was a language spontaneously created by the Holy Spirit, for the utterance of emotions, which no natural tongue could express." And further on the answer becomes more explicit. "The speaking was doubtless a something intermediate between singing and speech, analogous to what we call a recitative, and the meaning of it was more or less immediately comprehensible like that of music." Every well-disposed hearer understood this language at Pentecost. Neither there nor at Corinth was it incoherent and aimless.

The interpretation of the Aramaic words in I Cor. xvi, 23, illustrates certain tendencies of these late writers. Two of them (Ellicott and Göbel) regard the perfect, $\alpha\theta\alpha$, as having here a future force, and the clause equivalent to that of Phil. iv, 5—"the Lord is near." The Apostle used the words in close connection with the foregoing, meaning that the Lord, who was near, would ratify his anathema. The Aramaic is explained by supposing that the statement was a watchword in the early Church. It is thought by another (Edwards) that while the words in question refer to the future, they are also a mystic utterance. "The enthusiasm of the gift of tongues had taken possession of Paul. His words from hallowed associations, carry with them a meaning beyond what meets the ear. The air is filled with awe-inspiring voices premonitory of the coming of the Lord." And according to the third view (Godet) by a different division of the Aramaic letters, the words mean, "Come, O our Lord!" (*Māparāθā*) This is analogous to the closing prayer of the Apocalypse,

“Come, Lord Jesus!” The objection to this is that θα would be a most unusual imperative form. The Aramaic is explained by this writer in the following manner. Paul had a seal with the device, *Μαραντα θα*. This seal he used at the close of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. When the Epistle was copied, since the seal could not be reproduced, the copyists preserved the device. This is ingenious; but if the words were the device on Paul’s seal, they ought to stand, where the seal doubtless stood, at the very close of the Epistle.

Of the recent studies¹ in the Epistle to the Romans, one (Göbel’s) answers the question: Why did Paul send to the congregation in Rome in particular such a thorough presentation and defense of his doctrine of redemption, by three considerations. First, the associated life of the Christians at Rome was in an imperfect state, and the Epistle aims to deepen the faith of all the members, as a faith that is equally necessary for all, and that alone can secure for all alike salvation, and thus to knit closely the bonds binding the Jewish Christian groups with the great Gentile Christian majority. Second, the Apostle wished to guard the Roman Christians against the attacks of Judaizers by establishing them in the conviction that, while the law is powerless to renew, there are forces of moral renewal in the grace in which they stand. Third, the Apostle wished to give the Roman Christians an intelligent conception of the principles of his missionary career. He wished their support as he went to the far west, but

¹ *Der Römerbrief übersetzt und kurz erklärt.* Von Fr. Zimmer. Quedlinburg, 1887. *Der Brief Pauli an die Römer.* Von L. Göbel. Fr. Andreas Perthes. Gotha, 1887. *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans.* By Rev. Lyman Abbott. New York, 1888.

would not have them misunderstand his relation to his own countrymen. With these three aims the three parts of the doctrinal portion of the Epistle correspond.

The most elaborate and important of the recent studies of the Epistle to the Romans is that by an American scholar (Abbott). Very brief reference has been made in another place to the author's conception of Paul's fundamental doctrine. In this connection mention may be made, first, of a few points in his sketch of Paul's life and character. His view of the Apostle is that he was an idealist rather than a logician, a philanthropist rather than a philosopher, a poet rather than a scholastic. He was essentially a Christian mystic, and his teaching is, in its essence, that of the Fourth Gospel. It is said that Paul's Greek schooling was such as could be caught up in the street. It may be said in regard to this point that, according to late and reliable authority, the Jews of the Greek-speaking Diaspora used the Greek version of the law in their synagogues. This is a more adequate explanation of Paul's Greek knowledge. The opinion of Augustine, adopted by Godet in modern times but generally rejected, that the conversion of Paul began at the martyrdom of Stephen, is accepted by this American writer, but without producing any new grounds, or removing the objections which are presented by the writings of Paul.

The positiveness with which Paul's trouble with his eyes, experienced once in Galatia, is attributed to the physical impression of the heavenly vision does not seem to be supported by aught in the narratives. Neither can the marks which Paul calls the "marks of Jesus," nor the fact—if it

be such—that he generally wrote by an amanuensis, be traced with any special probability to that event.

The statement that Paul disregarded the regulations of the Old Testament, and paid no greater respect to those of the Christian Church at Jerusalem, hardly accords with facts, and to say that the church of that day possessed no creed, as is done several times, seems misleading. For, though the Apostolic Church may have had no written creed, it surely had as definite a creed and held it as tenaciously as the church has done at any period in its history. Whether a creed is written or unwritten is an unimportant incident. The importance of the commentary proper consists rather in its general exposition of the thought than in detailed exegesis. Two or three fundamental passages may be referred to in partial illustration and criticism of both these aspects of the work. First, as bearing upon the author's conception of Paul's use of *πιστις*, we may take the verse which reads “For what if some were without faith? shall their want of faith make of none effect the faithfulness of God?” The interpretation of this is as follows: “Shall the Jews' failure to perceive and welcome the spiritual life of God work against and make unfruitful God's perception of spiritual qualities in his Gentile children?” From this it would appear that the author takes the word *ἀπιστία* to signify “the Jews' failure to perceive and welcome the spiritual life of God.” In his general statement at the beginning of the chapter the thought is thus expressed: “the Jews' inability to perceive repentance and faith in a pagan.” And the clause *πιστιν τοῦ θεοῦ* he understands as meaning “God's perception of spiritual qualities in His Gentile children.” These ideas seem to

be drawn legitimately from the text. God's perception of spiritual qualities in his Gentile children hardly paraphrases, we think, what Paul means by *πιστιν τοῦ θεοῦ*, and the Jews' inability to perceive repentance and faith in a pagan hardly paraphrases what Paul meant by disbelief. It seems improbable that Paul thought of God as having faith in man in the same sense in which he thought of man's faith in God.

The author holds that *iλαστήριον* in chapter iii, 25, denotes Mercy-Seat. We are led to this meaning, he thinks, out of regard for "the fundamental principle of interpretation, that in all difficult passages every doubtful word is to be understood as the immediate readers would have understood it, or at least not inconsistently with such an understanding."

But, who shall decide how the immediate readers understood a particular word? Just here lies a very great difficulty. No one is quite in the position to say what the immediate readers understood by certain words. What is called a fundamental law of interpretation seems rather one of the aims of interpretation. Further, in the case before us, it may be fairly questioned whether the immediate readers, being predominantly Gentile, would have thought of the word *iλαστήριον* as signifying Mercy-Seat, a meaning which belongs to the Jewish ritual. The presumption is that Gentiles acquainted with the Greek language would have understood the word agreeably to the general teaching of Paul in which they found it, and it may surely be affirmed that Paul's thought does not move in the sphere of the Levitical ritual. In speaking of Paul's doctrine of the fall, the author takes the ground that the

Apostle's teaching is not inconsistent with the doctrine that man was gradually evolved by long and slow processes out of a lower and animal order. Paul's references to the fall of Adam are indirect and parenthetic. He lays no stress upon it, but puts all emphasis upon the perpetual fall of every man who sins against God's law.

The author regards chapter seven as a picture from the life, a description neither of a regenerate nor an unregenerate man, but a portrayal of universal experience. That there is a struggle in the hearts of disciples between the higher nature and the impulses, which can only learn obedience through strife and suffering, a conflict between the old man and the new man, needs no other demonstration than is afforded by the common experience, but that Paul has this struggle in mind no satisfactory evidence seems to be afforded by this new work.

As characteristic of the author's position on one of the theological questions of the day, we may quote his careful remark on Israel's salvation as a race (p. 192). "Does Paul merely mean that, as the result of the long processes of history, a remnant of the Jewish people will at last resume their primitive faith, see in the New Testament the flower and fruit of the Old, and in Christ the fulfilment of the hopes and the promises of Moses, David and Isaiah? Or does he mean that in some other sphere, some cycle beyond this one in which we live, some future scene of the great drama of redemption of which we see only a little part, the Jewish race, *as a race*, will discover that a veil has been over their faces, as they read Moses and the prophets, that traditionalism has blinded their faith, that they have not kept pace with the world's progress and the pro-

vidences of God, and will find what they did not find on earth, the glory of the Father in the face of Jesus Christ, his Son ! If to affirm this with positiveness is more than Paul's language will warrant, to deny the possibility of it is to deny the possibility of a hope which his words justly awaken. I am content to do neither ; but in the bewilderment of a hope too large to be defined, and yet too vague to be a creed, say with the Apostle, " O, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God ! "

Believing the word of Bacon that "the Scriptures have infinite springs and streams of doctrine to water the Church in every part," a recent writer seeks to point out some of these springs and streams in the Epistle to the Philippians.¹ The work is, properly speaking, a homiletical commentary. It is interesting to notice that the author feels warranted in tracing the origin and character of the Philippian Church to the influence of Lydia. It bears the impress of an ardent and organizing woman, an impress visible especially in activities of benevolence. The name which is above every name is thought to be the name "Jesus," not "Lord Christ." This was the Saviour's name by divine command before He was conceived in the womb. It was His after the Ascension, for Peter, in his Pentecostal sermon declared, "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." And the Saviour claimed this name in the very act of calling Paul himself into His service, saying, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest."

¹ *Lectures chiefly expository on St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians.*
By John Hutchinson. Edinburgh, 1887.

The bowing of every knee in the name of Jesus is understood of universal worship of Him. Nothing is said of the circumstances of time and place in which this worship takes place. It is not harmonized with the doctrine of the Apocalypse, that there will be conflict up to the very day of judgment, or with the doctrine of the eternal rejection of many who refuse to believe in the Son of God.

Of recent studies in the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon the most important is an English volume, homiletical rather than expository.¹ It lays down and observes the distinction between the certainty of God's word and the uncertainty of our inferences from that word. It comes from a mind which regards pure Theism as little better than a phantom, Agnosticism as a dreary proclamation, Materialism as something which can never hush the unconscious wail of many an Esau's heart—"My father, my father!" and Socinianism as that which has no warmth to thaw our frozen limbs. Its interpretation of difficult passages may be illustrated by two cases. The "all things" which are to be reconciled through Christ (Col. i, 20) are the material universe, which through the work of Christ shall be restored to its primal obedience. The reconciliation of things in the heavens is understood in a broad sense, as the drawing of intelligent beings in the heavens nearer to God. Again, "the afflictions of Christ," which the Apostle will fill up (Col. i, 24), are not afflictions borne for Christ, or imposed by Him, or like His, but afflictions which Christ bears with His followers by virtue of His mystical oneness with them and by virtue of

¹ *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Colossians and Philemon.* By Alexander Maclaren, D.D. Armstrong & Son, New York.

His sympathy. "In all our afflictions He is afflicted." It is suggested that Paul learned this lesson when on the way to Damascus, he heard the words, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou *me*?" He thought all the time that he was persecuting the *followers* of Jesus.

It has already been said that the investigators¹ of the past year hold the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, and three of the writers are German. Reference may be made here to some special points in the explanation of these Epistles.

Paul's statement that he is the chief of sinners (Tim. i. 15), is understood as expressing his serious thought, and as language which each individual ought to repeat concerning himself (Kölling). The truth of the statement lies in this, that each individual can see his own sin in its depths and know it intimately, while he can know the sin of others only superficially. The "childbearing" through which woman shall be saved (I Tim. ii. 15,) can not be understood as designating a particular way of salvation for women. They no less than men are to be saved through faith. The word which Paul uses for "childbearing" is not the ordinary expression, but a peculiar and significant

¹ *Der erste Brief Pauli an Timotheus.* Von Heinrich Kölling. Zweiter Theil: Die Auslegung. Berlin, 1887.

Praktisch-theologischer Kommentar zu den Pastoralbriefen des Apostel Paulus. Von Dr. Knoke. Erster Theil: Der zweite Brief an Timotheus. Göttingen, 1887.

The Epistles of St. Paul with notes. By James R. Boise, D.D., LL.D. D. Appleton & Co., N. Y., 1887.

Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Vierte Abtheilung: Die Gefangenschaftsbriebe des Apostel Paulus, Pastoralbriefe, Hebräerbrief, die katholischen Briefe und die Offenbarung Johannis. Nördlingen, 1888. C. H. Beck'sche Buchhandlung.

word. Its abstract ending takes it out of the sphere of the concrete, and suggests a higher meaning. According to the context it must denote that by which, in the New Testament economy of salvation, souls are saved. The word refers, then, to the birth of Jesus, to the Incarnation of the Son of God. Through this, faith being of course implied, woman shall be saved. This expression was used by Paul in the interest of harmony. It was to prevent pride on the part of man and bitterness in the heart of woman. It involves an unparalleled exaltation of the dignity of Christian women.

The charge that a candidate for the pastoral office must be the husband of one wife (I Tim. iii, 2), is still variously explained. The American contributor (Boise) says, "Husband of one wife at a given time, as opposed to more than one." The German commentator connects it closely with the preceding injunction—"the bishop must be without reproach,"—and makes the blamelessness appertain to his relation to his wife. The bishop must be wholly faithful to his wife, without lightness in his manner of dealing with other women. The charge can not be referred to bigamy or polygamy, because the New Testament knows nothing of these sins. Nor can the charge be directed against a second marriage, since second marriage is repeatedly recognized as lawful.

The "angels" by whom Christ was seen, according to the famous passage, "He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up into glory" (I Tim. iii, 16), are understood to have been the apostles, unto whom the risen Lord appeared (Kölling).

It is held that a reference to heavenly angels would be unimportant in this place, and that such an appearance would be without historical support, since we can not think that the reference is to the angels who appeared to Christ while He was on earth, and since the word ἄγγελοι would not be applicable to the spirits to whom Christ appeared in Hades. Plainly the words can not be referred to the Ascension, as that is the theme of the last clause. On the other hand, a reference to the apostles is eminently appropriate, because the fact of Christ's resurrection, made sure to the apostles by the actual appearance to them of the risen One, was central in the Apostolic preaching.

The latest studies in First Peter¹ accept a genuine proclamation of the Gospel by the Lord Jesus Christ to spirits in the spirit-world. The most important of these studies, however, adds nothing upon this topic to the results published in a different form, and noticed in the last volume of *Current Discussions*. In the German work of the past year the view is taken that the visit of Christ to the spirit-world was made after the resurrection, hence was the *descentus ad inferos* of which the ancient Church symbol speaks. This view assumes that the words "quickened in the spirit" refer to the resurrection. Both writers agree in simplifying the difficult passage regarding "the interrogation of a good conscience toward God" (I Peter iii, 21). The word επερωτημα is taken in the sense of request or prayer, and the thought of the whole clause is that the candidate for baptism offers prayer to God for a good

¹ *Wissenschaftlicher und Praktischer Commentar über den ersten Petrusbrief*. Von J. M. Usteri. Zwei Theile. Zürich, 1887.

Cf. Burger in the *Kurzgefasster Commentar*, 1888.

conscience, that is, a conscience purified by the forgiveness of sins. Such prayer is a necessary condition of the reception of baptism.

In the conviction that the Epistle to the Hebrews is one of the most difficult as well as one of the greatest of New Testament books, a volume has recently been contributed¹ which adds to the valuable practical literature on this epistle. The author's conception of the course of thought in the Epistle is noticeable in some points. For instance, the central idea in chapt. iii, 1-iv, 13, is the fundamental oneness of the Dispensations. Moses and Christ are equally God's stewards, and the threatenings and promises of the Old Testament are still in force in reference to apostasy from Christ or faithfulness to Him.

But this conception seems hardly in keeping with the manifest purpose of the Epistle to set forth the superiority of Christ's mediation over that of the Old Testament economy. Again, it is said that in the eleventh chapter the faith of Abraham is compared with that of Noah, Enoch and Abel. It is difficult to see any suggestion of such a comparison in the text, which mentions the heroes of faith in simple chronological succession. Mention may be made of one or two points in the interpretation. The question with which the first chapter of the Epistle closes: "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to do service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation?" seems to be regarded as implying uncertainty in the mind of the writer of the Epistle.

What seems to be a better interpretation regards the

¹ *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* By Thomas Charles Edwards. A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1888.

question as rhetorical, expressing in the most certain manner the fact, that all the angels, without exception, occupy, with reference to salvation, the subordinate position of servants. The fact that God spake unto the fathers in divers manners (i, 1) is regarded as signifying that the Old Testament revelation was not "homogeneous." Now it will be admitted that the Old Testament revelation was fragmentary, but hardly that it was not homogeneous. For it is all but the unfolding of the plan of redemption. Christ found himself in all the Scriptures (Luke xxiv, 27), and Paul says that the prophets spake concerning the Son, (Romans, i, 2-3). "*Norum testamentum in vetere latet.*"

Nothing of signal value has been added the past year to the exposition of the Revelation. The theory of the two-fold origin of the book, discussed in the last volume of *Current Discussions*, has met with little favor. It is thought that if the authors had retained it longer for critical examination, they would have abandoned it themselves as unsatisfactory.¹

An attempt² has been made, in the interest of a better understanding of the Revelation, to prove that the persons who are called "saints" constituted an inner organization within the Church, embracing only those who gave themselves wholly to the work of evangelization and of building up the churches. It is hardly needful to say that the attempt is a failure.

¹ Cf. Professor C. A. Briggs in *The Presbyterian Review* for Jan. 1888.

² *Die Heiligen.* Von C. H. Manchot. Leipzig, 1887.

The latest German commentator¹ recognizes the close relation between Christ's eschatological discourse and the Apocalypse. This is being more generally admitted, but the significance of the connection for the interpretation of the Apocalypse has not been duly considered. The latest work supports the view that the angels of the churches are their bishops. It regards the two beasts as symbolizing, the first the world power that is hostile to God, and the second, the false spiritual power. But the fulfillment of these symbols is not found in any particular language or land. So also with the symbol of Babylon. It is not to be limited to Rome, though Rome was the Babylon of John's own time. Thus this recent study rejects the contemporary theory of interpretation, and also the Church-History theory.

¹ *Kurzgefasster Commentar.* Vierte Abtheilung. *Die Offenbarung Johannis.* Von Dr. Robert Kübel. Nördlingen, 1888.

CHAPTER V.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

Of the difficult problem of the self-consciousness of the Lord Jesus only partially satisfactory solutions have been given, or, perhaps, can be given. That self-consciousness was unique, as the personality was unique, being human and divine. But the problem, though difficult, is attractive, and may properly be the object of reverent scientific investigation. Such investigation has recently been given to it.¹ There is special propriety in making such investigations in this present time, because the great thought of the Christian Church in our age is the Kingdom of Christ, and questions concerning this Kingdom depend upon the questions as to the character of Him in whom the Kingdom came (Grau). It is postulated that the self-consciousness of Jesus, as presented in His unquestioned words, is incomprehensible without admitting the miraculous element. One important way into the self-consciousness of Jesus is the study of His attitude toward the revelation of God in the Old Testament and in Nature. Freedom and authority are noticeable in His use of the Old Testament

¹ *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der Messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit.* Von W. Baldensperger. Strassburg, 1888.

Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu. Von Rudolph Fr. Grau. Nördlingen, 1887.

Scriptures. In His study of Nature He was one with all healthy and perfect men, noticeably with the Greeks, who were the most gifted of all the heathen nations of that time. Jesus was a full citizen in the natural world, and yet, at the same time, His language shows that He was a stranger there. Nature was for Him a parable of the spirit-world in which He lived. The same author holds that Jesus forgave sin in a manner that pre-supposed a special work and achievement. He did not forgive sin as a wholly independent, almighty God, or as the representative of the almighty God who dwells in heaven, a representative who has nothing else to do than to utter the will of God. Jesus, in representing Himself as the Shepherd and the Bridegroom and the Judge, shows that He had the Jehovah-consciousness (Grau). In all this, however, we find nothing of development.

More satisfactory in this respect is the study of another scholar (Baldensperger). The Messianic consciousness was developed, it is said, through religious experience, not by any process of reasoning. The appearance of Jesus as the Messiah was not usurpation, but obedience, not free choice, but divine necessity. It cost Him much to declare Himself the Messiah, but He did it out of a feeling of duty. The Messianic faith was not a hindrance to the free development of Jesus; on the contrary, it was the secret spring of His life, of His speaking and acting. His highest spiritual utterances sprang from the Messianic certainty. The facts regarded as most important in the development of the self-consciousness of Jesus as the Messiah are the ardent religious hopes of the time, the dead legalism

of the Jews, the baptism, and the temptation. It is thought that the unshakeable Messianic certainty with which Jesus ascended from the Jordan was not effected without the exercise of the almighty power of God. It was the result of a creative act, the only one in human history. The author does not point out the necessity of a creative act, nor does he say what it implies with regard to the personality of the Messiah. It is maintained that the Messianic certainty connected with the baptism did not bring a sudden transformation of all the views of Jesus. His conceptions of the coming kingdom, which were essentially those of the pious souls of His time, were gradually changed. There was a period, extending to the confession at Cæsarea-Philippi, in which His religious Messianic certainty struggled with the traditional Messianic faith, which was according to the understanding. He never lost His Messianic consciousness, but there was a time of intellectual arrangement and spiritual deepening of His Messianic faith. The second period, from Cæsarea-Philippi onward, was one of achieved clearness and perfect inner harmony. In this period the way of suffering is plain.

It may be noticed that the writer, in speaking of the Parousia, adopts the view that "nearness" is only a more concrete and intelligible expression for absolute certainty. Before the ardent longing of the pious soul the perspective of time and space is shortened. It seems hardly consistent with this view when the author says, further on, that Jesus actually erred in this reckoning. The error is regarded as only "formal," not springing out of a defective religious or moral consciousness. It is regarded as a real proof that religious perfection does not include omniscience.

The circumstances which led to the decree at the council of Jerusalem, the content of that decree, and the historical working of it are matters which invite more careful discussion. They are of great importance for the history of the Apostolic Church. We have now the first part of a monograph, treating two of the points.¹ The position of Paul was consistent with the teaching of the prophets and with the law itself, and yet it was natural that there should be opposition to the condition of the Church at Antioch. The idea of a Church in which there should be no distinction between Jew and Gentile was not prominent in the Old Testament. On the contrary, there are many passages which seem to imply the perpetuity of the Israelitish Church as a distinct body, and which seem to imply also that the Gentiles will receive a share in Israel's blessing only through incorporation with Israel. On these passages the zealots laid all stress, but the council had a better knowledge of Scripture. The norm of the Apostolic decree is not the Noachic injunctions, as has been held by many writers as far back as the Apostolic Constitutions, but rather the commandments found in Lev. xvii–xviii, which passage concerns the stranger who dwells in Israel. The Noachic commandments were for the heathen who wished to come into closer relation to Israel, but the council at Jerusalem regarded the Gentile Christians as actually accepted of God. Again, the Noachic commandments are reckoned as seven, while there are but four injunctions in the Apostolic decree. It is held that the word *πορνεία* must be taken in a broad sense, as covering all illicit sex-

¹ *Das Aposteldekret*. Von Joh. Georg Sommers, Königsberg, 1887.

ual relations, such as inter marriage with near relatives. One party of Christians could hardly insinuate that another party needed such an injunetion as is conveyed by the literal meaning of the word. That is true from our standpoint, but perhaps not from theirs. The sin of $\pi\sigma\rho\nu\varepsilon\iota\alpha$ was so common that John in the Apocalypse (xiv.4) speaks of the redeemed as those who have not committed it, and in whose mouth a lie is not found.

Recent Protestant discussions¹ of Paul's doctrine of justification agree that the Old Testament use of the word "justify" was the basis of Paul's usage, and agree also that the term was used in the Old Testament in a forensic sense. This is admitted even by a writer who holds that Paul uses the word in far other than a forensic sense (Abbott). This American writer argues that justification with Paul, means neither a "rightening" of the soul's relations with God, nor a "rightening" of the soul in its own nature, but that it means both of these things in one simple indivisible process. The forensic element is however the less important in this process. "Sacrifice is not a means to make it either possible or safe to remit penalty, but the divinely ordered means for the purification of character." It was a necessity of God's love, not of His justice. "Paul's doctrine of justification is that God possesses a

¹ *Der Paulinische Grundbegriff der δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*. Von Dr. Gustav A. Fricke, Leipzig, 1888.

Paul's Theology. *Andover Review* for Nov. and Dec., 1887. By Dr. Lyman Abbott.

Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung aus dem Glauben nach dem Neuen Testamente. Von R. Trümpert, Darmstadt, 1888.

The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. By Lyman Abbott. New York, 1888.

righteousness which forever goes out of himself that it may righten those who open their hearts to its influence." It restores the soul to itself, and restores the soul to God. The distinction between Protestants and Catholics is a distinction without a difference. When the Prodigal came to *himself*, he went to his *Father*. The first steps in the rectification of our souls and the first steps in the rectification of our relations with God are absolutely the same. Divine forgiveness is divine cleansing. The great cleanser is sympathy expressed through suffering. In this lies the significance of Christ's death. That death was not the consummation of sacrifice, but each suffering disciple becomes in his own sphere a sacrifice for sin, as his Master was for the whole world.

In sharp contrast with this view are the conclusions of the German writers whose works have just been mentioned. In the teaching of Paul, it is said (Trümpert), the act of justification is, on God's part, none other than it was under the Old Dispensation, it is a declaring righteous. But the condition is no longer faithfulness to a covenant of works, but firm confidence in the merit of Christ's work, especially the atoning efficacy of His sufferings and death. On the ground of this, even the ungodly is declared righteous. A moral value is conceded to him which he does not have by virtue of his relation to the divine moral law, and hence justification is more than forgiveness of sins. Also according to the monograph of the Leipzig theologian, the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* is a *justitia forensis* in contrast to every *justitia propria* or *infusa*. The subjective and principally ethical element in this *δικαιοσύνη* is faith. All men are capable of receiving the righteousness, all need it

alike, all see it offered to them, and of absolute predestination to receive or reject it the entire Bible knows nothing. The atonement was required both by the human conscience and the holiness of God. This statement is based upon sound exegesis of Scripture, while that of the American writer referred to above seems to be peculiarly weak at this point.

Some material for a Biblical theology of the Pauline letters is furnished by recent studies. These letters, it is held,¹ contain no doctrine that is wholly new. Paul was not a second founder of Christianity. His teaching in all its essential parts was founded upon the teaching of Jesus. Even in eschatology, that which is new in his writings is not of the essence of the doctrine, but is incidental.

In a study on prayer,² according to the Pauline writings, it is well said that thanksgiving was the signature of the New Testament age, in the thought of Paul. Upon this form of prayer he lays great emphasis. It is held that Christ is not thought of by Paul as the channel through which the thanksgivings reach the Father. This conception belongs rather to the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the Pastoral Letters praise is directed to Christ, not to God, and prayer at the table is regarded as prayer of consecration. Paul's words about striving in prayer unto God imply that prayer is a means of influencing God and it is farther said that Paul in his message to the Colossian Church, represents prayer as a means of ascetic discipline, a struggle against the assaults of Satan.

¹ *Die Briefe des Apostel Paulus und die Reden des Herrn Jesus.* Von Fr. Roos. Ludwigsburg, 1887.

² *Das Gebet nach den Paulinischen Schriften.* Von Fried. Zimmern. Königsberg, 1887.

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the writings of Paul¹ has been carefully studied the past year. Of the condition of man before the reception of the Spirit it is firmly maintained against rationalistic writers, that Paul did not regard sin as inseparably connected with the flesh. Decisive against this are his reference to Christ's flesh, and his account of Adam's transgression. The act of Adam was not the coming forward of a slumbering principle, but the entrance of a new principle, through the deception practised by a power outside of humanity. Paul's conception of the *σάρξ* is wholly explicable on the basis of the Old Testament, without bringing in any influence of Alexandrian philosophy.

The reception of the Spirit, according to Paul, is conditioned upon the death of Christ, because through that event fellowship is established between God and man. The Holy Spirit is spoken of as the Spirit of Christ because the Apostle regards the exalted Lord as having the fulness of the Spirit. Fellowship with Christ in the Spirit is fellowship of person with person. It is not a figurative expression, signifying only the memory of a historical picture, and the influence of the motives connected therewith. Such a fellowship would not recognize, as a necessary presupposition, the resurrection of Christ. The activity of the Spirit may be summed up in the word "quickeneth." This quickening is manifested in the certainty of God's love and of future glory, in overcoming the flesh and communicating love, and in the importation of knowledge concerning God and Christ and the moral problems of Christianity.

¹ *Der Heilige Geist in der Heilsverkündigung des Paulus.* Von Joh. Gloel. Halle, 1888.

The conception of holiness in the New Testament is the theme of a recent German study,¹ which received the prize from a Dutch society devoted to Christian Apologetics. It is held that an essential modification of the content of ἅγιος takes place on the basis of the new revelation in Christ Jesus. The divine majesty and purity, which lie in the conception of holiness, are freed from all representation of passion, jealousy or outer Levitical cleanness, and are ethically transfigured to express God's perfection which is exalted above everything sinful.

The New Testament modification is seen in the combination "holy Father," which does not occur in the Old Testament. "Holy" as applied to God expresses His separation from man, "Father" brings Him near in love. It is in keeping with this modification that the New Testament speaks relatively seldom of the holiness of God, the Old Testament relatively often. Holy, in the New Testament, is the predicate of the Spirit rather than of the Father as in the Old. The fundamental conception of it, as applied to man, is separation from everything profane, to be God's possession, and its specific content is determined by the character of God. Christians regarded themselves as holy on the basis of Christ's work and of the equipment with the Holy Spirit. This was true of the Gentiles no less than of the chosen people. The author regards the sources as constraining us to the view that the Spirit is the *consciousness* of God's grace. He is for the believer the highest personal assurance. This position does away at once with the personality of the Spirit.

¹ *Der Begriff der Heiligkeit im Neuen Testamente.* Eine von der Haager Gesellschaft zur Vertheidigung der Christlichen Religion gekrönte Preisschrift. Von Ernst Issel. Leiden, 1887.

In the department of New Testament eschatology little original investigation has been made since our last volume was published. The effort to make *αιώνιος* mean spiritual and supersensuous, which never enjoyed the favor of many eritics, is not in the way of gaining greater support. It is said by a recent writer¹ that the usage of *αιώνεις* in the Gnostic philosophy of the second century is not a safe guide to its meaning in the earlier New Testament writings. Further, *αιώνιος* can not be said to signify spiritual simply because the coming age of the Messiah is spiritual, for the same word is used of the unspiritual Jewish age. And, moreover, to render the word by spiritual or supersensuous would destroy the sense of scores of passages in the New Testament. What, for instance, would it mean to say that "God is blessed unto the spiritualities," and that "glory is to be given to Him unto all the spiritualities of the spiritualities?" It is admitted that the New Testament doctrine regarding the last things is still obscure in not a few particulars. A late volume² that seeks to present this doctrine in a simple manner for ordinary Christian readers, is in part an illustration of this. It distinguishes spiritual death from eternal death as clearly as it draws the line between death spiritual and physical. It regards the New Testament references to Hades as favorable to the doctrine of prayer for departed saints, and, in speaking of the resurrection, seems to identify body and flesh, thus adding greatly to the embarrassments of the subject. It also holds that a

¹ Cf. *The Expositor* for Oct., 1887. Article by Joseph Angus, D.D.

² *Five Last Things.* Studies in Holy Scripture. J. A. Spencer, S.T.D. Thomas Whittaker, New York, 1887 and 1888.

man must have the identical body which he had before death, in order to give an account of the things done in the body.

The most noteworthy recent contribution on New Testament Eschatology is an English work¹ on the Parousia, which should have been noticed in last year's *Current Discussions*, but it was not received in season.

The theory is briefly this, that the Parousia of Christ, with all its accompaniments—resurrection, judgment, and consummation of the kingdom—took place at the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 A.D. A candid effort is made to explain all the prophecies of the New Testament, which relate to Christ's second coming on this basis. The testimony of John the Baptist concerning the judgment of the coming Messiah, the parables of the Tares and Drag-net, the lament over Jerusalem, the entire eschatological discourse with its preaching to all nations, the judgment of the sheep and the goats, the apostolic commission to go into all the earth, the Johannean references to "the last day," "the resurrection" and "the last judgment," the descent of the Lord and the rapture of the saints mentioned in Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians, the destruction of death, and the entire prophecy of the Apocalypse find their fulfillment prior to the destruction of Jerusalem or in that event. The only New Testament prophecies whose fulfillment lies on this side of the fall of Jerusalem are those which refer to the Millennial Kingdom and the loosing of Satan. This theory would indeed greatly

¹ *The Parousia. A Critical Inquiry into the New Testament Doctrine of our Lord's Second Coming.* By J. Stuart Russell. New Edition. London, 1887.

simplify the doctrine of the Parousia, if it could be established. This, however, has not yet been accomplished.

The theory breaks down whether examined exegetically or historically. It is impossible, for instance, to justify the exegesis which finds the utmost limit contemplated in the parables of the Tares and the Drag-net in the destruction of Jerusalem. Both parables are plainly Messianic. They speak of the activity of the Son of Man, not of the activity of the Law. They speak of the kingdom of Heaven, toward which the Jewish dispensation looked, and not of the last chapter of that dispensation. To identify the angel-reapers with the Roman legions is just the kind of departure from the plain meaning of the text against which the author frequently and energetically protests. Another point at which the theory utterly fails, exegetically, is the interpretation of the word *γῆ*. When Jesus says "all the tribes of the earth," we are to understand by "earth" only the land of Judea, says the author. It is said that the restricted sense of the Greek word is common in the New Testament. But what is the fact? Out of about two hundred and fifty passages in which the word is used, there is not one single instance where, standing without modifiers, it plainly refers to the land of Judea. There are, at the most, but three or four passages with their parallels where this limitation can be thought probable. The term *φυλαὶ* by no means limits the word *γῆ* to Palestine, for when the New Testament refers to the tribes of Israel the standing expression is the "twelve tribes" (Mt. xix, 28; L. xxii, 30; Jas. i, 1; Rev. xxi, 12.) Similar violence is done to the language when the expression "all nations," in the account of the judgment of the sheep

and the goats, is referred solely to Israel. This language is absolutely general, and it is interpreted by the author as narrowly specific. The plural is inapplicable to the one people of Israel, and it is utterly without parallel that the Jews should be called $\varepsilon\theta\nu\eta$ (Mt. xxv, 32: $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\varepsilon\theta\nu\eta$). Other examples of this sort need not be given. The exegetical foundation of the theory is wholly inadequate. If it be regarded from a historical standpoint, this theory is open to equally grave criticism. The destruction of Jerusalem was something negative; the consummation of the kingdom of Christ is positive. Further, the destruction of Jerusalem seems to have had no very appreciable influence in the direction of a consummation of the kingdom of heaven. It removed some of the bitterest enemies of that kingdom, but in what other way did it render signal service, to say nothing of its having led to the actual consummation of the kingdom?

Another obstacle of this sort is the strong historical evidence that the Apocalypse was composed long after the destruction of Jerusalem—evidence which is completely ignored by the work in question.

We are asked to believe that the events described by Paul in the First Letter to the Thessalonians—the descent of the Lord and the rapture of the living saints—could have taken place and yet have left no discoverable trace on the page of history. There is nothing unphilosophical, it is said, nothing irrational, or impossible in the supposition that the resurrection of the dead saints and the transformation of the living ones should have taken place without observation and without record. But if any of the living saints were transformed, they were all transformed, for

Paul's language admits of no exceptions. But if all were transformed and caught up into heaven, if the whole militant Church was gathered into the skies, who established the Church over again? Whence came the thousands of Christian believers whom we meet with at the close of the first century? This fact may be accounted for. But it is wholly incredible that the saints could have been transformed without leaving any impression of the marvelous fact upon history. It was not so in the case of Enoch, or in the case of Elijah; much less is it conceivable, if a great multitude, and among them Paul, were caught up suddenly from their labors to meet the Lord in the air. These examples may serve to show how weak is the historical foundation of this theory of the Parousia.

HISTORIC THEOLOGY.

PRESENT STATE
OF
STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.
BY
REV. HUGH M. SCOTT,
PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.



INTRODUCTION.

HISTORIC METHODS AND ORIGIN OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

It has been remarked with truth, and that by a theologian of the liberal school, that the New Testament is an orthodox book. The observation is as applicable historically as it is theologically, hence we are not altogether surprised on opening a recent work upon the origin of Christianity¹ to be told that the true way to discover the original Gospel is to set aside the New Testament sources, and see how it appears in the Christian and profane literature of the first two centuries. By such a method the author learns that Christianity was at first a reform movement among the Jews in opposition to Legalism.² These Reformers in Israel were called “the saints”; a second stage of this reaction gave rise to *of χρηστόι, χρηστιανοί*, “the good;” under the lead of the Gnostics, Simon Magus and Marcion, these movements blended; then came a further reaction against too much spiritualizing and Gnosticism, which led to Christianity with a bodily form, and the invention of a semi-historic basis in the New Testament. Jesus, Peter, Paul, and the rest are fictitious characters, a product of the

¹ *Antiqua Mater. A Study of Christian Origins.* Anonymous. London. Trübner & Co., 1887.

² Pick again refutes the view that Christianity was an outgrowth of Essenism. *Christ and the Essenes*, in *The Lutheran Quarterly*, April, 1888.

latter part of the second century. Professor Loman thinks¹ the tendency of this book is in the right direction, but considers it questionable to make the Jesus and Paul of the New Testament entirely unhistorical, and accept Simon Magus and Marcion as their historic substitute. How do we know, he asks, that Simon was the forerunner of Marcion, or that he was the apostle of the spiritual religion?² To the rejection of the Bible here advocated an American writer adds the rejection of the Church.³ "As students," he says, "we cannot do without the facts; but as earnest-minded men, we can do without the Church." It is "at its best only an incidental phase of the social instinct in religion." He finds two superstitions floating down the ages, (1.) "worship of the Bible as a fetich," and (2.) "the authority of the Church over consciencee." The Infallible Book and the Infallible Church, he thinks, will die together. Such utterances sometimes leave the impression that earnest religious convictions are antagonistic to historic verity. And yet love of poetry or love of music does not unfit a man to write the history of these arts. We are not commanded to worship truth, but to worship God. And it is the men of most devout spirit who declare themselves most anxious to "set down naught in malice," and to speak the whole truth in love. With such convic-

¹ *Een engelsch anonymous over den oorsprong des christendoms*, in *Theolog. Tijdschrift*, 1887, p. 597.

² A similar, uncritical work is *The Christ and the Fathers*; or the Reformers of the Roman Empire. By a historical Scientist. London, Williams & Norgate, 1887.

³ Slier, *Study of Church History for its own sake*, in *The Unitarian Review*, Dec., 1887.

tions Coxe says¹ "that in the search of historic truth, he who begins not with the inspired narratives has no education that prepares him for the task." He finds the secret of history in the Word of God, which shows the unity of the human race, a guiding Providence, and a single goal. Secular history is but comparative history; Christian history, however, "is the history of man as very man, the image of his Maker." In the deepest sense Christianity is civilization, and Christian history is the history of civilization. To cut off the historic continuity of the "infallible" Church of Rome, Coxe makes prominent the fact that the Church of the first centuries was Greek in its great thinkers, councils and monuments.

The solidarity of history, touched upon by Coxe, keeping the man in his national surroundings in vital unity with the Christian in his church frame-work, is also made prominent by Fisher,² especially in the relation of doctrinal development to the general thought of the period. The Manual of Jennings³ "aims to represent the facts from an ethical rather than a religious standpoint, and to exclude the influence of theological proclivity." Most suggestive is the little book of Sohm,⁴ which also makes prominent the relations of ecclesiastical and secular history. Out of a rich fulness of suggestions we can select but a few points. He observes that Early Christianity did not oc-

¹ *Institutes of Christian History*, an Introduction to Historic Reading and Study. Chicago, A. C. McClurg & Co., 1887. \$1.50.

² *History of the Christian Church*. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887. \$3.50.

³ *Manual of Church History*. New York. T. Whittaker, 1887.

⁴ *Kirchengeschichte im Umriss*. Leipzig. G. Böhme, 1888.

cupy a vacuum caused by decaying heathenism, but rather "in the first and second centuries of the Empire we find a constantly growing development of the religious spirit, whose steps can be traced in Seneca¹ and Marcus Aurelius." Stoic philosophy, influenced by Platonism, created a longing for a divine revelation and for a redemption. The heathen mysteries, too, were forerunners of Christianity, washings looking towards baptism, festal meals, towards the Lord's Supper, and the brotherhood of religious clubs, towards Christian Churches. Pressense widens this thought² into his favorite view, that all false religions were designed by God to prepare the way for the Gospel, by arousing a desire for the Revelation of Christ, and showing that man unaided could not work out his own salvation.

But, Sohm continues, these points of resemblance must not be carried too far, for the early Christians felt themselves so distinct from Rome that they were assured the Caesars must fall to make room for Christ, and the Kingdom of God appear upon the ruins of the Empire. Here was the treason of believers, here their "hatred of the whole human race" in Roman eyes. And yet, when the persecutions burst upon the Church, "it conquered not through the Christians, but in spite of the Christians, through the power of the Gospel"; the mass of the Church made terms with Rome rather than suffer martyrdom.³

¹ But Seneca was not under Christian influences. Cf. Ribbeck *Seneca der Philosoph und sein Verhältniss zu Epikur, Plato und dem Christenthum*. Hannover, Gödel, 1887, M. 2.

² *The Ancient World and Christianity*. London. Hodder & Stoughton, 1888.

³ For the fullest embodiment of recent investigation, see Kurtz,

Turning now to the general classification of the materials of Church History, the question arises as to secular and religious influences in determining such a division. Wolff holds that some ecclesiastical event should be decisive in marking periods, and proposes the following chronological scheme.¹

A. FIRST PERIOD: Church Antiquity, or the Period of the "One" Church.

First Section: To the first General Council at Nicæa, 325, the time to the first public appearance of the Church.

Second Section: From the Council of Nicæa to Pope Nicholas I, 325–858, the time to the first Church Schism.

B. SECOND PERIOD: The Ecclesiastical Middle Ages, or the Period of the Papacy.

First Section: Nicholas I to Leo IX, 858–1048, the growth of the Papacy, the time to the definite separation of the Eastern and Western Churches.

Second Section: From Leo IX, to the Papal Schism, 1048–1378, the flourishing period of the Papacy.

C. THIRD PERIOD: The Modern Church, or the Period of the Evangelical Church.

First Section: From the Reformation to the Peace of Westphalia, 1517–1648, the time to the

Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 10th ed. 1887, M. 16; by far the most complete book for the student. English translation. New York. Funk & Wagnalls. Vol. I, 1889. \$1.50.

¹ Zur Zeiteintheilung der Kirchengeschichte, in *Zeitschrift f. Kirchl. Wissenschaft u. K. Leben.* 1887. H. 8.

definite separation of the Roman and Evangelical Churches.

Second Section: From the Peace of Westphalia to the Prussian Union, 1648–1817, the period of the weakening of the Confessional Spirit.

Third Section: From the Prussian Union to the present time, 1817–1888, the age of the re-awakening of Church faith.

This classification begins with the period of the "One" Church, but lying back of that "One" Church is the complicated problem, how did the primitive, congregational, undogmatic, Apostolic Church, with no written creed, and no New Testament Canon, become the Early Catholic Church of the middle of the Second Century, with outlined creed, Episcopal government, and regular New Testament? Into this inquiry Professor Otto Pfleiderer has recently entered.¹ He departs farther than ever from the views of Baur, and says that the opposing tendencies of Petrine and Pauline Christianity, which appeared in the Apostolic period, were not the governing principles in the post-Apostolic age; for then the Gentile Church took shape, and developed, from the beginning on, upon the ground of Hellenism, which lay beyond such opposing schools. Ritschl first pointed out this defect in Baur's view; now Pfleiderer cannot accept the theory which Ritschl has substituted, for, he says, it is rather a return to the dogmatic notions of early Protestant theologians, who explained the doctrines of the early Church as a deterioration of those of the Apostles. Harnack especially

¹ *Das Urchristenthum, seine Schriften und Lehren im Zusammenhang beschrieben.* Berlin. G. Reimer, 1887. M. 14.

sets forth this view, making Hellenism thrust itself suddenly, by means of Gnosticism, into Christianity, and secularize it. This "degradation theory," Pfleiderer thinks, cannot find historic support; for Hellenism was not unknown to Pauline theology, and it played a controlling part in the deutero-Pauline and Johannine theology. "If," he continues, "Hellenic modes of thought as such were to be regarded as a perversion of Christian truth, as these theologians seem to suppose, then we must come to the strange conclusion, that Christian theology, already in the New Testament beginnings, had fallen away from Christian truth. With the impossibility of this conclusion the theory dissolves itself." Rejecting the theories of Baur and Ritschl, Pfleiderer says but one other remains, and it is so simple and natural, he wonders that it has not long ere this received general acceptance. He states it thus: "Since the Gentile Universal Church was planted, through the preaching of Christ, upon soil which had long been prepared by pre-Christian Hellenism, it follows that this Hellenism and that preaching of Christ were the two factors, from the union of which, the peculiar character of Gentile Christianity can be naturally explained from the beginning on, and from the reciprocal relation of which—their penetration, or separation, the prevalence or decadence of the one or the other factor—the different forms of development of the primitive Christian and early Church doctrinal modes of thought can be apprehended in a perfectly natural way." He holds that the Gentile Church, from the very beginning, in the West, completely separated from Judaism as a national religion, and openly antagonized it. Jewish Christians were, consequently, very

little followed. It is true the Old Testament had great influence upon Early Christianity, but it was not as Jewish law, but as a Christian revelation, to be received with Christian freedom. It was taken in a Christian sense, just as Judaism itself had in pre-Christian Hellenism been spiritualized by Greek Hellenism. In this indirect form of Hellenism, in which Judaism had stripped off all that was local and national from monotheism, and breathed in the spirit of Greek idealism, the Old Testament religion had great influence on Christianity. Since Paul freed Christianity from Palestinian narrowness, it took the form, in the Graeco-Roman world, of Christianized Hellenism. This deutero-Paulinism begins with the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the whole development of Christian thought, he holds, from that Epistle on, is to be explained on this theory. Hilgenfeld thinks this idea of a short-lived Jewish Christianity and an all prevailing christianizing of Hellenism, goes very little beyond the criticism of the old Tübingen school.¹

¹ *Pfeiffer's Urchristenthum*, in *Ztfl. f. Wiss. Theologie*. 1888. H. 4.

CHAPTER I.

THE EARLY CHURCH.

I. RELATION OF CHURCH AND EMPIRE.

Christ was born under the first Roman Emperor, and thinking men soon began to see that here appeared two great forces in organized form, the visible Kingdom of God and the pagan Empire of Rome, that could never dwell together in harmony. A recent writer says,¹ “Caesarism and Christianity clashed” in persecutions, because “the first leading idea implanted by Christ in the minds of his followers was the idea of a Kingdom.” When Christianity appeared “the world had become Roman. But through the rise of the Emperors the old Roman system had already gone through an essential transformation: *politically*, the city of Rome had become a world, and therefore the rule of the many been replaced by the rule of the one; *socially*, the vanquished, by their numbers, their labor, and their intelligence had taken the place of the victors, and consequently the narrow and rigid laws of the Republic must yield to the comprehensive and mild laws of the Empire;

¹ See Carr, *The Church and the Roman Empire*, in *Epochs of Church History*, edited by Creighton, London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1887, 2s. 6d.; cf. also Plummer, *The Church of the Early Fathers. External history*; same series; and *Sketches of Church and State in the first Eight Centuries*. By W. Armitage, London: Rivington, 1887, 5s.

philosophically, a blending of schools had taken place, looking toward one end, and therefore the study of morals, which sets out from the unity of human nature, took the place of metaphysical speculations ; *religiously*, the national religion, which had put the worship of the divine Roma and the Emperors in the place of local cults, was overcome by Christianity, which claimed to embrace not one people or empire, but the whole human race.¹ The spread of the Gospel was promoted by dark providences. The bad harvests of A.D. 42–48, spread hunger through the whole Empire. Sickness followed, and these things coming upon the community of goods introduced in Jerusalem, drove many believers away from the Holy City. “The poor of Jerusalem” spread through the cities of the Empire, especially in Asia Minor and Greece ; this was the beginning of the propagation of Christianity through the Roman Empire. (Volz, p. 43). It is well known that the first converts of these poor missionaries came chiefly from the lower classes. The freedmen formed a fruitful field for the new religion. Hitherto, the prevalent opinion drawn from writers like Tacitus, has been rather unfavorable to this class of the Roman people ; but a recent study presents the matter in a more attractive light.² Freedmen formed about one quarter of the population of the Empire. This class recruited their strength chiefly by manumission. They were largely the working men in Rome, and had well nigh a monopoly of some kinds of business. More

¹ Cf. also Volz, *Die Anfänge des Christenthums im Rahmen ihrer Zeit*. Leipzig, 1888. An outline to the time of Constantine.

² Lemonnier, *Étude historique sur la condition privée des affranchis aux trois premiers siècles de l'Empire Romain*. Paris, 1887.

than one-half of their names are found to be Greek, a fact which Lemonnier traces to the great slave markets in the Greek Orient. These were the “captive Greece that took captive its fierce conqueror.” In life and morals the freedmen were no better and no worse than were their Roman patrons. They seem, however, to have been more susceptible to Gospel influences than many native Romans, and from this class, including Jewish freedmen, doubtless the larger part of the first Church in Rome arose. It scarcely seems accidental that Paul, the great Apostle to the Gentiles, sprang himself from a naturalized citizen of Rome, perhaps even a former slave. This Roman Jew, at all events, is the first great figure in Church History. Setting out with him, Weingarten finds the thoughts of his wonderful missionary career to have been, “The world for Christ,” and his work was accordingly two-fold, (1) to deliver the Gentile Christian world from the Old Testament law, and (2) the evangelization of Europe.¹ It is doubtful, he thinks, if Peter was ever in Rome; if the story of Paul and Peter laboring there is mythical, it did not spring from a Judaistic, anti-Pauline tendency, but was rather a product of the “Apostolic Successions” of the rising Catholic, traditional theory. Under the Emperors, from Trajan to Marcus Aurelius, he finds no persecution except “sporadic outbursts of popular fanaticism,” for the rulers were tolerant and the organization of the Christian Churches in the form of “clubs of the poor” or

¹ Cf. his well-known *Zeittafeln und Ueberblicke zur Kirchengeschichte*, the third and greatly improved edition. Hartung & Sohn, Rudolstadt, 1888. M. 4.50. A book of great value, especially to teachers.

“funeral clubs” brought them within the scope of legal societies. The vast catacombs of the second and third century in Rome, put this, he says, beyond all doubt. Arnold, however, from a study of the persecution under Trajan, comes to somewhat different results.² He defends the genuineness of the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan, and finds it shed fresh light upon the relation of the Early Church to the club system of the Empire. These societies were at first social with a festal meal ; they then became places for exchanging gifts ; and later political bribery entered them, for the Provincial legislature of Bithynia had considerable powers and chose the Chief Priest of the province, who had control of the plays, festivals, etc. Hence, Trajan opposed the club system in Bithynia. Arnold thinks the Parthians may have worked for their interests in these organizations, and so made them dreaded in Rome, where similar societies were encouraged.

The measures taken against them were very likely such as Augustus and Tiberius put in force against the Druid circles. Here, as against Christians, men were accused (1) of treason, (2) of insult to the national gods, (3) of illegal secret meetings, and (4) of magic, for all of which the penalty was death. Both Druidism and Christianity were charged with offering human sacrifices, and both protested against the omnipotence of the Roman State. Pliny was familiar with the persecution of Christians ; the only question was respecting the extent to which it was to be applied in Bithynia. We learn that Roman citizens must be sent to Rome for trial, in cases involving capital

² *Studien zur Geschichte der Plinianischen Christenverfolgung.* Königsberg, 1887.

punishment. Such journeys of Christians—as in the case of Ignatius—must have done much to spread the Gospel. In inns and elsewhere many people would be met, and spoken to. Thus Paul traveled towards Rome a prisoner, preaching by the way; and thus, doubtless, not a few of those sent to the capital by Pliny, scattered the seeds of the new faith by the wayside. Pliny speaks of the great neglect of sacrifices because of the spread of Christianity; it is quite probable, Arnold thinks, that the informers against the Christians in Bithynia were cattle dealers and others whose interests suffered from the preaching that Christ had by one sacrifice of Himself forever put an end to the offering of bulls and goats. The governor knew that Christians could never be brought to worship idols or speak ill of Christ. Hence he tested them, when suspected, by commanding them to pray before statues of the emperors. Christians regarded such a thing as idolatry and an appeal to demoniacal powers, and would not obey. Neither could they say a word against Christ, for He was the center of all their faith and hope. This was the test in the days of Paul; (see I Cor. xii, 3) it continued to be the test in the days of Pliny, and, later, of Polycarp. The alternative presented so early, of Christ or the gods of the Empire, points to the divinity of the Saviour, and the blasphemy implied in speaking lightly of Him. Even faithless Christians, who told the governor they had left the Church twenty years before, did not venture to say that Christianity was different later from what it was earlier, when believers sang a hymn to Christ as God. Coming to the question of the Church as a legal club, Arnold says nothing would have been more foolish than for the

Christians of Bithynia to gather as a “club of the poor,” in order to be safer financially, for all such societies were forbidden. Besides, the Apostle had forbidden appeal to the State against a dishonest official, (I Cor. i, 7), and Christians would not collect church dues by the civil arm. Christian congregations did not fall under the same category as the heathen clubs with their festal meals (against Heinrici). The Christians did not so regard their meetings. Only some backsliders forsook the *Agape*, lest the outward resemblance to the *εραροι* might get them into danger. If the Christian gatherings were regarded as “funeral clubs” it is very strange, he urges, that neither the accused believers nor Pliny ever referred to that argument. Instead of any such reference, we find the weak Christians afraid that their “love feasts” might lead to their meetings being considered a *collegium illicitum*. So Arnold holds, against Heinrici and others, that, in Bithynia at least, congregations of Christians could not be regarded without special permission, as entitled to exist on the ground of being “burial societies.” The heathen regarded Christian meetings as clubs, hence they were persecuted under Pliny just because the State had already made a thorough clearing out of such societies. But, apart from the *Agape*, there is nothing in Pliny’s letter to make us think that the Christian churches borrowed their organization from heathenism. “Here, as in other matters, the new spirit of the Church created no doubt its own forms; the connection with anything already existing had but secondary importance throughout.” The *Agapæ* themselves, it is held, did not arise in imitation of heathen feasts, but in commemoration of Christ’s love as seen the night of his betrayal.

Allard approaches the study of the persecutions from the archaeological side.¹ He rejects the view of Dodwell and others, that Gallus did not declare war against the Christian society. Blood flowed less freely under this ruler than before, but we still hear of bishops exiled and dying far from home, Christians in prison, and martyrs at the stake. The persecution of Gallus formed a connecting link between that of Decius and that of Valerian. Of this last persecution under Valerian, Allard says, though it looks on the surface very like that under Decius, it was really very different. The two emperors were quite unlike ; the stern Decius, full of ideas of Roman reform, persecuted the Church to work social and religious improvement ; the fickle Valerian was at first a friend of the Christians, then turned against them, following foreign influences, and with a bad conscience attacked the Church. He sought to crush it as a rich society and confiscate its goods. He was greedy, he was superstitious, he was hesitating, he was cruel. Decius did what he thought was right, and by a sharp, sword-like edict forbade the new religion. A consoling element in this contrast of persecutions is that, while under Decius the Church was so surprised after long peace, that Christians in masses forsook the faith, under Valerian, we hear of only individual apostasies. Both persecutions, however, had this in common, the growing apathy of the populace, once so fierce against the Christians. Under the Antonines, informers were active, and the emperors must sometimes restrain the fury of the people ; but, in the third century a radical change appears, an imperial edict must

¹ *Les dernières persécutions du troisième siècle.* (Gallus, Valérien, Aurélien.) Paris. Lecoffre, 1887.

start the persecution and declare Christians enemies of the State. Magistrates must now do the work of informers, for the populace had become indifferent. “The Jews still insulted the martyrs; the true Roman people protested by their silence.” The battle against Christians was left to the official authorities, assisted by some philosophers.

This Christian problem, Allard continued, had two sides; first there was a “body of Christians,” assembling, holding property, and appearing perfectly legitimate; then there was the brotherhood, the secret fellowship, the separation, which pointed to danger and caution. With the corporation Rome could deal, but what of the religion? This seems to have been largely ignored, where the Empire dealt leniently with the Church. Regarding it as a burial club or some sort of society, the State kept an illogical peace with it. “The science of government consists sometimes in wishing to see only the half of things.” It was so in the third century, when the Church enjoyed long intervals of peace. Then, circumstances came which destroyed this fiction in the mind of the emperor, and it was demanded of Christians, “What are you plotting against the princes under pretext of religion?” Members of a “funeral society” became all at once enemies of the State. This change took place under Decius and Valerian. Then Gallienus came, and ended this ambiguity; he not only restored the Church to its former doubtful position—the common view—but granted Christians all the rights of recognized religions. His edict, Allard says, was a true treaty of peace between the Church and State. It turned Roman policy into a new channel, which, after some lesser persecutions, it finally occupied full and free after the edict of Milan by Constantine.

How well the father of Constantine had learned this broader lesson, of monotheism, respect for Christian morals, and toleration of this purer faith, has been fully set forth for the first time by Görres.¹ So strong was this current of State policy in post-Nicene days that even Julian the Apostate did not venture to depart far from it. He betook himself largely to literary attacks upon Christianity. His aim, he said, was to show "all the world, by what reason he was convinced, that the sect of the Galileans was a mischievous, trumped-up, petty human sin, that there was nothing divine about it, but that it followed fabulous and senseless childish methods of thought, and brought forward belief in miracles as proof of truth."² It was, he held, a hash of Hellenistic and Hebrew elements, the bad out of each, made up of the denial of the gods, which it borrowed from the Hebrews, and an immoral life, which it got from the Greeks. There is no positive revelation, for that is unnecessary ; all men know of God, who is over all, and to whom all can pray. Thus Julian repeats the old objections, especially those of Celsus. His attack had an important influence in arousing Christian apologists to fresh activity, so that we can speak, in the Greek Church, of a Julian period of Apologetics. Especially Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 444) did for Julian what Origen had done in replying to Celsus.³

¹ *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Constantius I.*, in *Ztfl. f. wiss. Theologie*. 1887, H. 1.

² Cf. Zöckler, *Julianus u. seine christlichen Gegner*, in *Beweis des Glaubens*. Feb. and March, 1888.

³ See two opposing accounts of Julian, *Julian the Emperor* containing Gregory Nazianzen's two *Invectives* and Libanius' *Monody*, with Julian's Extant Theosophical Works. Translated by C. W. King. London. G. Bell & Sons. 1885. 5s.

Beyond the Roman Empire, the relation of Church and State seems to have been still more unfavorable to the former than under the proud sway of the Caesars. Görres gives an interesting account of the Church in Persia,¹ distinguishing (1) the period of its origin, (2) the age of conflict with the Pagan State in the fourth and first half of the fifth century, then (3) the Church becoming Nestorian and reconciled to the State, a period lasting from about A. D. 450 to the fall of Persia before the Arabs, A. D. 651. The Persian persecutions were much worse than the Roman; “the systematic persecutions of Decius, Valerian, Diocletian were harmless in comparison with the attack upon Christianity by the State of the Sassaniden.” The periods of martyrdom were longer in Persia than in Rome. In the West, apostates were spared, in the East, all were cut down; lapsed Persian Christians must even act as executioners of their faithful brethren, to show their contempt of them. In one respect, however, there was an advantage in Persia; there the machinery for punishment was not so rigid and complete as in Rome, for all depended upon the ruling Persian king. When the Church in the East became Nestorian (450), and separated from the imperial Church, persecutions ceased, for then political suspicion of friendship for Rome also ceased.

II. HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.²

The various parties in the Apostolic Church, according to Weingarten (l. c.), were (1) the Pharisaic-Judaistic, to

¹ *Das Christenthum im Sassanidenreich*, in *Ztft. f. wiss. Theologie*, 1888. H. 4.

² For a very valuable hand-books see Schmid's *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, fourth edition by Hauck, in which the extracts from

which he assigns the Christ party in Corinth, (2) the party of the "pillar" Apostles (Gal. ii, 9), with which he identifies the Peter-party in Corinth, and (3) Pauline Christians, who included the Apollos party in Corinth, in which Pauline teaching had a coloring from Alexandrian philosophy. Respecting the Jewish Church, Weingarten agrees with Harnack, that "Jewish Christianity had, after the destruction of Jerusalem and by the close of the first century, sunk to an insignificant sect," called usually Ebionites. It was no longer of importance for the Graeco-Roman world. The Church passed to the Gentiles, and, instead of Judaizing legalism, Pagan philosophy was to be the foremost foe. Sohm (l. c.) calls the heathen thought, that entered Christianity, Gnosticism, "the monotheistic philosophy of the Roman Empire making its first great attempt to conquer practically the world of those days." It was the treaty of peace, which the culture of the second century presented to Christianity. Weingarten thinks Christian Gnosticism was rather an ecclesiastical religious development than a philosophic movement. "Its esoteric Christianity, mystery terminology and cultus, its mystic baptism of the Spirituals, its references to Homer and the Eleusinian mysteries," all point to a transformation of Christianity after the plan of the ancient mysteries. He considers the Simon Magus of the Clementine writings as a representative of philosophical heathenism, rather than a caricature of the Apostle Paul. Harnack, however, finds¹

the sources, quadrupled by Hauck, make this book for History of Doctrine what Gieseler's History is in general. Nördlingen. C. H. Beck, 1887, pp. 414. M. 4.

¹ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Vol. xxii, 1887. Article *Simon Magus*.

three pictures of Simon in documents of the first three centuries. He is (1) a Samaritan Messiah, seeking to establish a new religion by means of Christianity; (2) he is founder of a school of Gnostics and the father of heresies; (3) he is a caricature of Paul. This last view, that of the Tübingen school, Harnack says, shows how untenable their whole theory is, for it must invert the order of the original documents to reach such a result. The account in the Acts is correct. Simonian Gnosis was related to Simon as the Christian Gnosis to Christ. Harnack continues: "The fusing together of Simon and Christ, a Syncretistic-Gnostic conception of the world and its creation, and an ethical antinomianism are the distinctive features of this new universal religion." Simonism was, therefore, "a rival system to Christianity," and borrowed largely from it. From a similar Palestinian source does King derive Gnosticism.¹ He says the deepest mysteries of the Egyptian Mysteries, found in the Gnostic Gospel, called Pistis-Sophia, were identical with those of the Rabbinical Kabbala, simply putting the teachings into the mouth of Scripture personages. The seeds of the original Gnosis, King says, were of Indian growth; they were borne westward by Buddhist influences into Asia Minor and Egypt, two centuries before Christ, and, colored by the Mysteries of Mithras and Serapis worship, they blossomed into all the heresies of Christian Gnosticism. In this mystic worship a follower of Zoroaster "might continue a Mithraicist and yet accept all the doctrines of Christianity." So pervasive were these Gnostic speculations that they appeared in the

¹ *The Gnostics and their Remains*, a new edition. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1887. \$6.00. With plates.

oppositions of false science against which Paul spoke—they were familiar long before to the Kabbalists, who dabbled in the views of Zoroaster—and centuries later they culminated in Manichæism. Just because of the blending of heathen and Christian elements in Gnosticism it drew upon itself the attacks of both pagan philosophers and Church theologians. For the first eight centuries, nearly every Christian apologist refers to this heresy. Then came silence respecting it until the sixteenth century, when Erasmus, Grabe and others revived the study of Gnosticism.¹ The first modern attempt at study was to confirm what the fathers had written. Finally, Amélineau says, it is admitted that Gnosticism was neither Oriental in origin, nor a product of Greek philosophy, nor a blending of Christianity and Judaism, but a vast Syncretism. It appeared in a time of great mental activity, an activity stimulated also by the Gospel. The Egyptian form of Gnosis, our author traces from Simon Magus to Valentine. Arianism and Manichæism were also outgrowths of Gnostic thought. He finds the system of Basilides had little originality; he borrowed from other Eastern teachings, and had much in common with Simon Magus and Menander. Both the systems of Basilides and Valentine, according to Amélineau, are a development of that of Simon Magus, and Simon got his doctrines from the Kabbala and the Zendavesta. This writer coincides further with King in finding much of the Valentinian terminology in the teachings of the priests of Thebes and Memphis. Foreign thought is there; but that of Egypt is always uppermost.

¹ Cf. Amélineau, *Essai sur le gnosticisme Égyptien, ses développements et son origine Égyptienne.* Paris, Leroux, 1887.

Somewhat similar is the law of Lipsius.¹ He thinks the theory of emanations is of Eastern origin. Its dualistic basis was thrust aside by Platonic pantheism, yet at every turn it can be recognized. Lipsius corrects the common statements about Valentine in some points. This teacher went to Cyprus before he went to Rome. He became head of a school in this city, while still a member of the Church. There were two divisions of his school, an Eastern and a Western. The first ideas made prominent in this system were those of the higher origin of the Spirituals among men, and of the Demiurge. Docetic Christology was at first not exclusively held by Gnostics. The anthropological and ethical sides of the system were made prominent earliest. Jesus, it was taught, by his steadfastness and self-control wrought out for himself divinity. Valentine held a monistic view of the world: the flesh depends on the soul of the Demiurge, the Demiurge on the spirit without the Pleroma, that is the Sophia, the Sophia, on Horos and Pleroma, the Pleroma of aeons, on the Father, the Source of all.

Meyboom thinks that the Gnostic movement under Marcion was of little importance.² "So much is certain, the 'Lord,' and the 'Apostle' were chief figures in Marcion's theology." Jesus, the ideal man, the apotheosis of the true God, and Paul, the apostle of liberty, dominated the teaching. It is doubtful if Marcion was a docetic. He denied the resurrection of Christ's body. He spoke of three or

¹ Article *Valentine*, in Smith & Wace *Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature and Doctrines during the first eight centuries*. Vol. iv. N—Z. London, 1887.

² *Marcion en de Marcioniten*. Leiden. P. Engels & Zoon. 1888.

four abstract principles as God, good, and bad, and Satan being among them. His followers were strict ascetics.

Judaistic error exalted the humanity of Christ till his divinity was lost ; then followed Gnosticism, exalting his divinity until nothing was left but a transcendental Saviour. Out of all the controversy the question must be raised anew, Where is Christ, and what is He ? Weingarten says, (l. c.) that the hypostatic doctrine of the Logos, before Athanasius, rested on a Platonic-Philonic base ; and it was essential for this idea that Christ should be regarded from the point of view of divine activity in creation. The Logos was the hypostatic medium of creation. That was Subordinationism : and Arianism was the close of this earlier, Philonic, metaphysical, cosmological apprehension of the Logos as a creative divine potency. A change came with Athanasius. Weingarten points out that now the religious form of the doctrine of the Logos took the place of the old metaphysical view. The Logos was presented as the principle of salvation, the consubstantial Son of God, through whose incarnation mankind is redeemed, and regains the divine likeness. Athanasius rejected the heathen half God of Arianism in behalf of the absolute dignity of Christianity. The true life of piety springs from full communion with God, not through a creature, but through the Divine Mediator.¹ Philosophical speculation in theology was here broken through, but it was not fully overthrown. Especially in the high places of the doctrine

¹ For a practical application of the Nicene creed, see the new edition of the *Didascalia CCCXVIII patrum pseudopigrapha*, by Hyvernat, Paris, Leroux, 1887. The present Greek text came through a Coptic translation from the work of Athanasius, *Syn-tagma doctrinæ ad monachos*.

of the Godhead and the origin of evil can traces of Greek philosophy be seen. Weingarten even thinks that "the proper ground of Augustine's unconditioned predestination and his philosophical determinism, was his Neo-Platonic conception of God." And yet Paul held some pretty high views on these subjects, long before Neo-Platonism saw the light. In Lactantius, too, the heathen idea of dualism is found cropping out in the midst of his *Apology for Christianity*. Martens rejects the ordinary view, that this was a remnant of his previous pagan education;¹ he finds it rising naturally in the Christian contrast of Church and State, the kingdom of God and the God of this world, with the ideas of ascetic separation from the human to attain unto the divine. Heathen dualism took Christian form. Lactantius setting out from *ethical* dualism, that sin is necessary as a foil to virtue, comes in his ethico-teleological view of the world to *physical* dualism, as the necessary condition for the realization of the ethical world-ideal. But this world arose through the creative will of God, hence God willed and created evil. Lactantius shrank from this consequence, but landed in *metaphysical* dualism. At this point the charge of Manichæism was fastened upon him.

The course of these remarks indicates largely the drift of historic study; from Arianism in the East the student moves naturally to Augustine and Pelagianism in the West. This current of thought has left the Greek Church of the sixth century and later much neglected by the critical historian. Into this dark region Loos has entered

¹ *Das dualistische System des Lactanz*, in *Beweis des Glaubens*. Jan.—May, 1888.

and come forth with a study of Leontius of Byzantium, one of the eighty-nine churchmen of that name mentioned in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, belonging for the most part to the Post-Nicene Greek Church.¹ He finds this theologian to have been a leader in the sixth century, under Justinian, in helping bring the Cyrillic type of orthodoxy to victory, and encouraging the growing Aristotelic thought, which was working over Greek theology into Scholasticism. He was also one of the Scythian monks, who came to Constantinople and Rome A.D. 519, respecting the theopaschite controversy, that is, that one of the trinity had suffered in the flesh. He was present, representing Jerusalem monks, at the conference in 531, ordered by Justinian with the Severians, in Constantinople. He was also the Origenist Leontius of the Life of Saba. The work of another Leontius, bishop of Neapolis in Cyprus, of less importance, has also just been published for the first time by Rose.²

We now come to the most important work of the year on the *History of Doctrine*, that by Harnack.³

He considers the History of Doctrine to be, side by side with the study of the New Testament, in the present condition of Protestantism, the most important branch of research for every man, who wishes really to study theology.

¹ *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche*. I. Buch. Das Leben u. die polem. Werke des Leontius von Byzanz. Leipzig. Hinrichs. 1887. M. 10.

² *Leben des heiligen David von Thessalonike*, griechisch nach der einzigen bisher aufgefundenen Handschrift. Berlin. Asher & Co. 1887. M. 1.

³ *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Bd. II. Die Entwicklung des kirchlichen Dogmas. Freiburg, i. B., 1887.

He treats first of "the development of dogma as the doctrine of the God-Man on the ground of natural theology." He sets out with his favorite idea, that "the first main part of the History of Doctrine closed with the reception of the doctrine of the Logos as the central dogma of the Church, and, consequently, with the transformation of the old formulæ of faith by means of philosophic theology, in the East. The Testament of primitive Christianity, the Bible, and the Testament of the Antique, Neo-Platonic speculation, by the end of the third century were blended, and, as it appeared, inseparable in the great churches of the East." Greek philosophy, he thinks, took the place in the framework of the creeds, which the Roman civil system took in the hierarchical structure; in other words, the Christian Church is largely the Græco-Roman Empire of thought and government preserved under the garb of Christianity. Of course Christianity was not completely Hellenized; the Bible, and early Christian writings prevented that, and kept the Gospel from being lost in "Gnosis" and the "new law." But, as the secularizing process went on, the Bible was allegorically expanded to meet it, or Apostolic tradition covered the heathen ritual that was introduced. The early apologists set forth Christianity as the religion of pure reason and strict morals, but through the superstition that poured into the Church from A. D. 250 on, it became a religion of potent mysteries and ritualistic sanctity. The union of Church and State attracted to the former everything that seemed holy or venerable. The Life of Christ and the Apostolic history became the centre of a mass of legends, in which saints, martyrs, and even heathen sages and gods were confounded. Until the

middle of the third century, Harnack thinks, every Catholic Christian was a monotheist ; but, in the fourth century, polytheistic notions crept in with the numerous converts. Emperor worship, demon worship, saint worship, and a new heathenism threatened Christianity. Nineteenth century spiritualism was then vigorous among the heathen, and it pressed, in the third, still more, in the fourth century, into Christian circles. It had already spread among Gnostics and Manichæans. Christianity threatened to go to pieces in a mass of local cults. The imperial constitution with General Councils worked for unity ; so did Monasticism, for now the Church had all grades in her service, priests for mysteries, monks for contemplative life, and laymen for ordinary existence. And yet, on the other hand, great bishops helped disunion, and monkish negative piety might undermine all historic religion. Even theology itself threatened to dissolve the Church in the surrounding world. Harnack finds the importance of Origen to have been, (1) in his sharp separation of Faith and Knowledge, (2) in the rich material of his speculations, the conservative sense, with which he knew how to incorporate all that was valuable, and the equipoise in which he held the different factors of his system, (3) in the Biblical stamp which he gave his theology by leaning carefully upon texts of Scripture. But his followers in the Church confounded these things, especially faith and theology, and made scientific dogmatics one with Church doctrines. This led to confusion and imperilled Church unity. How now was harmony to be reached between tradition and speculation, Pistis and Gnosis ? Already the dogma of the Logos had come from the circumference to

the center of belief. Origen had recognized the full significance of the historic Christ for the stage of Faith, while he referred the Gnostic to the eternal Logos. Now the danger arose that the historic Christ would disappear altogether. Polytheistic ideas were creeping in respecting God's nature. A Logos-Christ appeared more cosmological than soteriological, of doubtful nature and origin. Views arose of the incarnation and redemption as an enlightening of the human race, and so amid a cloud of philosophical terms Christianity seemed ready to merge into mere Deism. Harnack repeats, "that the Logos doctrine, which took root in the Church, was the strongest means in completely blotting out the image of the historic Christ, and dissolving all in mist." Behind this Logos was the idea of God as the *πρώτη οὐσία*, the *οὐ*, an incapable and actionless being. Along these lines drifted the thought of Eusebius of Cæsarea, and the conservative theologians, who planted themselves on tradition. Like the Neo-Platonists, they next derived a second and third *οὐσία* from the first, and adorned the Logos, created from the will of the Father, with the highest, yet variable attributes. They taught his incarnation, and celebrated the results of it, though in indefinite, saying little and much, Biblical formulae. Finally they subordinated all that was inward and moral to the idea of free will and human independence. That was the conservative theology of the year A. D. 320, resting upon Origen. All phases of belief were tolerated, provided they did not demand exclusiveness.

The second part of the History of Doctrine, the History of its development, Harnack finds opened with Athanasius. Only Augustine excels him in importance; "for

Augustine is an Origen and Athanasius in one person, nay he is more."

The Church has produced two great systems of theology, that of Origen and that of Augustine ; and the history of theology in the East is the history of the setting aside of Origen's system, while the history of theology in the West is the history of the setting aside of the system of Augustine ; in the one case more rapidly, and condemning Origen, in the other, gradually, and honoring Augustine as the greatest teacher of the Church. In both cases the overthrow of the system brought the loss of a connected, consistent cosmology. Harnack admits, however, that it is a question for the future historian, whether the thoughts of Augustine or Athanasius will last the longer ; the preference at present, he says, is for Athanasius. His importance lay in his making that view of God and Christ exclusively accepted, in which the power of religion then lay. He did a work of *reduction*. He gave Christianity its own place upon the captured soil of Greek philosophy ; and centered all upon the thought of man's redemption through the God-Man.

He took the helm in this sea of speculation, and his guiding thought was this: the divine, which appeared in Jesus Christ, was of the nature of the Godhead, and for that reason only was able to exalt us to divine life. The certainty of that thought gave faith its power, gave life its law, and theology its course. The most important advance in theology made by Athanasius was, that he no longer regarded the Logos of the philosophers, the world, idea, as the Logos whom he worshipped, the bringer of salvation. "Nature and revelation are no longer identi-

cal ; the Logos-Son-Christ is essentially no longer a world principle but a salvation principle.” The order of thought —Logos, Incarnation, God-man, God-likeness, Sons of God—we find already in Irenaeus ; it was the work of Athanasius, as a reformer, to make this teaching exclusive and effective in a time when everything was drifting. He regarded the Christian faith as essentially summed up in belief in the God-Man, the incarnation, and redemption to a God-like life ; for that reason he allowed freedom in other opinions. The Eastern Church has added nothing to this teaching of Athanasius ; the Western Church also has preserved his faith as its basis. “Presupposing the theology of the Apologists and Origen, he was the effective means of warding off the full Hellenization and secularization of Christianity.” Harnack continues, “The history of doctrine in the East, since the Nicene creed, shows two interwoven courses of development. First, the idea of the God-Man was defined on all sides, from the point of view of the redemption of the human race to a divine life ; that is the belief of Athanasius.” With this a second development was closely connected ; it had to do with the relation of dogma to theology—Harnack makes dogma in the strict sense of the word belief in the God-Man—and here the question was respecting theological science as Origen had prosecuted it. When a theological principle had become a doctrine of the Church, then it must always have been held as part of Apostolic teaching, so the orthodox reasoned, and very soon the men who framed it came to be regarded as witnesses, not as producers, and the honored men of earlier days, who knew nothing of such a dogma, or may have contradicted it, must be ignored,

their works dropped, or corrected by the substitution of others.

During the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries we thus see (1) a constant conflict against the free theology of Origen, against the heterodoxy and speculations, which it included; and (2) we notice a rising traditionalism, which suspected theological research in the work of the Church of that day, and set authority in its place, putting “the old theologians partly in Heaven as saints, and partly in Hell as heretics.” The result was certain, and theologians shrank more and more from their thankless labor. So, when a certain body of dogma was formed, enough to occupy the mind and admit of scholastic treatment, it grew restive, and rejected further development, or new accretions. Church belief overthrew free theology. In the Origenistic controversy, which lasted more than a few years, as usually stated, and in the condemnation of the school of Antioch, the movement went on. The gain of such a process was, that the Church thereby shut out foreign influences and concentrated thought upon what was more distinctively Christian. The speculations that tried to adhere to theology were so weak, that they dropped off naturally, and there remained, what the great majority of the “conservatives” through the dogmatical controversy desired, a mysterious, sacred dogma, which could be accepted, and theologians might be free to become antiquarians or philosophers. The loss in this process was that the Church no longer possessed a complete system of theology. Rejecting the system of Origen, the Church had left one great dogma and a number of fragments of doctrine, artificially held together by an appeal to Scrip-

ture and Tradition; also by Aristotelic scholastics. At the fifth General Council, in Constantinople, A. D. 553, the theology of Chalcedon was assumed, and upon it as a basis there grew up in this century an orthodox churchly theology. It added the spirit of Cyrill's teaching to the creed of Chalcedon, and made it more comprehensible. To this system the Neo-Platonic mystical theology joined itself, and an important development took place. Piety and dogma embraced each other in this scholastic-mystic theology, which arose on the ground of tradition and authority. Henceforth theology was to be but a hand-maid of the Chalcedon-Justinian tradition. And yet in this movement Neo-Platonic thought and Aristotelic methods did much more than is usually supposed.

Harnack reiterates again and again, that all the dogmatic controversies in the East, from the fourth to the seventh century, had for their theme Christology in the narrower sense of the term, and the Incarnation. Here, it was felt, was the center of Christianity; hence the view of the salvation that Christianity brought must be derived from the formulæ about which men then contended, and which finally prevailed. Harnack finds, accordingly, that the being of the Christian religion and, consequently, the contents of belief in the East, in this period, can be summed up in this: "The salvation offered in Christianity consists in the redemption of the human race from destruction, and the sin connected therewith, to a divine life, that is to an eternal vision of God. This has already taken place in the incarnation of the Son of God, and comes to humanity through the intimate connection with him. Christianity is the religion, which delivers from death and leads to the

vision of God." In other words, the highest good in Christianity is the reception into divine sonship, which is assured to believers, and is fulfilled in the participation in the divine nature, in the deification [*Vergottung*] of man through the gift of immortality, which includes the full knowledge and permanent vision of God in perfect blessedness, but without removing the distinction [*Abstand*] between Christ and believers. This thought of the deification of believers was prominent among all these early theologians. It rooted in the fact of Christ's incarnation. The Divine had already appeared on the earth, and joined himself indissolubly to human nature. So the Being of Christ underlay all Christian hope, and the belief of the Church embraced nothing else than the right knowledge of the nature of the incarnate Logos, because this knowledge included the certain hope of a change of human nature analogous to that of the Godhead of Jesus Christ, and that included all that man can desire. This is the line of thought, which Harnack finds running, more or less clearly, through all the dogmatic developments of these three centuries. It was greatly modified by the Gospel accounts of Christ, by Pauline teachings, and by other broadening influences, so that the correct theological formula prevailed in the fourth century; and in the three following centuries, when an incorrect formula prevailed, the current theology knew how to treat it in an orthodox spirit. "The Evangelical view of Christ was preserved in higher degree in the Byzantine and Nestorian churches, on the ground of the doctrine of the two natures, than in the Monophysite churches." And yet the dogma of the God-Man, springing from the doctrine of redemption, kept a commanding

place, and was in the strict sense alone dogma. Of the work of Christ, Harnack says, all we can state is, there were different apprehensions of it, which stood in no fixed relation to the dogma of the God-Man. The dogma was, however, always interpreted eschatologically; as was said “the work of the Christian is nothing else but a thinking upon death.” In this life we have a foretaste and an earnest of what we are to enjoy hereafter in its fullness. From this great central dogma of the God-Man the doctrines of God, the world, free will, sin, etc., appear as pre-suppositions, to be considered only so far as they are involved in a full understanding of the Divine Incarnation. So Harnack arranges his book according to the following plan:

- A. *The presuppositions of the Doctrine of Redemption*, or Natural Theology, under which he puts (1) The presuppositions of God the Creator as the Giver of Redemption, and (2) The presuppositions of Man as the receiver of Redemption. He here gives a large place to the influence of Greek philosophy.
- B. *The Doctrine of Redemption in the Person of the God-Man in its historic development*, which embraces, (1) The necessity and reality of Redemption through the Incarnation of the Son of God, with an appendix on the ideas of Redemption from the devil and expiation through the work of the God-Man, (2) The doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son of God with God himself, with an appendix on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the Trinity, (3) The doctrine of the human nature of the incarnate Son

of God, and (4) The doctrine of the personal oneness of the divine and human natures in the incarnate Son of God.

C. *The anticipatory enjoyment of Redemption, in the Mysteries, Etc.* Harnack puts in an introductory chapter, Sources of Knowledge and Authorities, that is, the Doctrine of Scripture, Tradition and the Church.

This Greek theology, which is here set forth, is very attractive, but Harnack finds it defective, (1) in not making ‘the highest concepts, those of ‘the moral good,’ and ‘blessedness,’ an organic part of the system ; (2) in making positive morality subordinate to asceticism ; (3) through a complete caricaturing of the historic Christ.” It looks as if Harnack would regard the Christ of the Fourth Gospel as also a historic caricature, so afraid is he of connecting any term, that looks toward philosophy, with the Saviour.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

What the visible Church of God is, whose history man can write, has been well set forth by Ross, from the Congregational, and, as most patristic scholars now admit, primitive point of view.¹ He treats of the Roman Catholic, the Episcopal, the Presbyterian, and the Congregational theories of the Church. The larger part of his treatise is then devoted to the Doctrine of the Christian

¹ *The Church-Kingdom.* Lectures on Congregationalism. Congregational S. School and Publishing Society. Chicago, 1887.

Church, under which he discusses its government, worship, discipline, fellowship, creed and activities. The general principles underlying all his treatment of the subject in detail, Ross sums up more than once in the words of Hatch, the Episcopalian: "All organizations, whether ecclesiastical or civil, must be, as the early churches were, more or less democratical; and the most significant fact of modern Church history is that, within the last hundred years, many millions of our race and our Church, without departing from the ancient faith, have slipped from beneath the inelastic framework of the ancient organization and formed a group of new societies on the basis of a closer Christian brotherhood and an almost absolute democracy." A similar general position is taken by Rigg, who holds that all forms of Church government are matters of Christian expediency.¹ The New Testament lays down a few general principles, and leaves the details of application to the Church of each age for the needs of that age. He rejects the High Church theory, as without support in the Apostolic Church. He says the first churches formed were Congregational in government, but adds, "The apostolic history and letters prove that the Congregational form represents, not an ideal model, but particular instances arising out of circumstances; that its limits and its special features represent, not perfection of form and full development, but defect of opportunity and arrest of influence and extension arising from such defect, and that its fundamental principles of negation, erected as they are into dogmas of limitation, are in contradiction to the

¹ *A Comparative View of Church Organizations.* London. T. Woolmer. 1887.

spirit and vital tendency of Church development in the apostolic age." He urges the same objections against Presbyterianism; it is not only "contrary to the precedents of the primitive Church and to the spirit which governed its development," but its "economy fixes as the necessary and universal law of the Church some points of usage which, so far as they obtained in the apostolic age, were occasional and accidental." In the line of these remarks, most modern critics, whether rationalistic or evangelical, proceed to trace the rise of the constitution of the Early Church as a historic growth. Manchot sets out from the idea that there was a sort of aristocracy, or brotherhood within the Church until the beginning of the persecutions under Trajan.¹ It had its center in Asia Minor, and extended its connections thence as far as Judea, on the one side, and to Italy, by way of Greece, on the other. They were the "saints," a society that regarded its members as inspired, and to which there belonged, on the one hand, the active promoters of Christianity, Apostles, Prophets, Teachers, and, on the other, those who formed an inner circle about those leaders, and provided the first outlines for the formation of local societies. Hence the "saints" in Early Church literature do not mean all Church members, but a particular circle, around which all others were to rally. These are the "saints" of the Apocalypse, which he puts in the time of Trajan, and these were the "clubs" that Pliny sought to suppress. The model circle of this kind Manchot finds

¹ Cf. *Die Heiligen. Ein Beitrag zum Verständniss der Offenbarung Johannis und der altchristlichen Verfassung.* Leipzig. Veit & Co. M. 5.

in the Roman Church, where this form of activity took shape in imitation of the stricter Roman club organization, rather than of the more elastic and democratic constitutions of the Greek committees. In this connection there arose also in Rome the monarchical Episcopate.

Weingarten finds (l. c.) the officers of the original congregation to have been “the seven” and the “pillar” apostles (Gal. ii, 9). Presbyters appear first in the later view (Acts xi, 30; xv, 22). The Pauline churches were free in their organization. First Cor. xii, 28 shows the *Kυβερνήσεις* reckoned to the charismata, and the Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers of this passage (cf. Eph. iv, 11) were not permanent officers, neither of the single congregation nor of the rising Church Universal. We see in Corinth that the congregation was the ruling body both in discipline and government. He says the first Pauline organization consisted in subjection to the *ἀπαρχάτι* (I Cor. xvi, 15), a family patronship in connection with service of the saints. (Rom. xii, 8; xvi, 2, of Phoebe; Phill. iv, 2, of Euodia.) The office of elder did not arise in connection with the synagogue system. Presbyter and bishop are identical in the Pastoral Epistles. Through the band of elders the charismatic gift was imparted to Timothy. The Epistle of Clement shows a feeling of superiority in the Roman Church. The letter opposes irregularities which had arisen in Corinth through the desire to apply to the Christian Church the democratic principles of the Greek societies. He allows the “honorable men” in the Church to nominate, but the “whole Church” should utter its voice in the election of presbyters. Until Soter and Victor, the leaders of the Roman congregation were called elders,

after that bishops. The work of turning the original congregational churches into one Episcopal Church, Weingarten ascribes essentially to the churches of Asia Minor, led by Polycarp, Serapion of Antioch and others. He finds this change in the Church to be a reflection of a similar change taking place in the State. The Empire succeeded the Republic, and "the idea of all civil life as existing in the form of a society was replaced by that of a permanent institution." So the Catholic Church arose upon the ruins of the free Christian Brotherhood, and clergy and laity began to be distinguished, just as *ordo* and *populus collegii* were distinguished in the heathen clubs. And, as those who represented these clubs were called an *Ordo*, so the Church came to have its representation in the clergy, as an Order. Imperial development in the State and hierarchical development in the Church had many points of analogy in the middle of the second century. Thus the deification of the bishop was like the honor paid to the *summus sacerdos*. An inscription describes a priest as *sacerdos sanctae reginae judicio majestatis ejus electus*. Parallel, too, with the distinction of *magistratus majores et minores*, in the State, there ran, during the third century, the distinction of *ordines majores*, that is, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and *ordines minores*, that is subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, ostiarii, lectors, in the Church.

Milligan thinks that the term presbyter in the Apostolic Church did not describe an office at all; it was, like "Reverend," a general title of honor applied to religious officers.¹ But if The Acts is a historic book such a title

¹ *The Expositor*, Nov., 1887.

must have indicated official rank. (See xi, 30; xiv, 23). Heron, on the other hand, says,¹ it is clear that the writer of Acts considered the primary official title to be that of elder; that of bishop was only secondary and descriptive of work. He holds, further, that the Jewish elder “was the original and archetype of the Christian functionary.” The important fact is, that, by whatever name or names those officers may have been designated, whether bishops or presbyters, or both, “there was a plurality of these office-bearers in each congregation, and they were elected by the free choice of the Christian people.” They formed a council or committee, chosen by the congregation, and constituted the free governing power of the early churches. Heron thinks the apostles, other than the Twelve, mentioned in the New Testament and the *Didache*, were evangelists, or itinerant missionaries, like Timothy and Titus, whose one business it was to preach the Gospel, and start churches among the heathen; then depart to other regions to be evangelized. He considers Hatch’s theory of Early Church organization completely at variance with the history which the Acts gives of the development of the Primitive Church. If that book is historic authority, Hatch’s view is untenable. The term “bishop” (Acts xx, 28), is a synonym for “presbyter,” and there is no hint that his work was chiefly financial. Acts xi, 30 shows the presbyters in charge of the offerings, just as Clement of Rome and Polycarp represent them. The Acts also contradicts Hatch’s statement that the Jewish term “elders,” and the office meant by it, did not at once

¹ *The Church of the Sub-Apostolic Age.* London. Hodder and Stoughton. 1888.

prevail among the Gentile churches, as indicated Acts xiii, 48 ; xiv, 1. Heinrici also admits this, if the Acts be accepted as historic and authoritative. In reference to the test case of Corinth, Heron holds there must have been a regular organization here also, for Clement of Rome, writing not forty years after Paul to this Church, speaks of the Apostles having appointed "presbyters" there "who had for a long time" been honored. There were men then living in Corinth who could remember Paul, and know if Clement was wrong. "Hatch's attempt to show that the organization of the Gentile Church was an independent and spontaneous growth," Heron calls "a complete failure." Apostolic church government was not a chance growth, he maintains; the Apostles adopted the plan of having a committee chosen by every congregation to guide its affairs, because that method was best suited to the free spirit of Christianity. Neither Jewish nor Gentile models were slavishly followed. This plan can be applied to the most varying circumstances. It is worthy of the Lord, to whom it is referred by the Scriptures themselves (Eph. iv, 11 ; I Cor. xii, 28). Heron about proves the identity of bishops and elders in the first century, against Harnack, who holds that they were different officers from the first.

A similar view of the growth of the Early Church is set forth in a valuable series of articles by Seyerlen.¹

He thinks the organization of the Early Church grew up naturally to meet the peculiar needs of the Christian

¹ *Die Entstehung des Episkopats in der christlichen Kirche*, in *Zeitschrift f. prakt. Theologie*, Frankfurt, 1887 ; pp. 97-143 ; 201-244 : 297-333.

congregation. It was not deeply influenced either by the synagogue or by heathen societies, by clubs or by municipalities. In the congregation in Jerusalem, there sprang up about the Apostles and James, a council of presbyters. The “seven,” who cared for the poor, were analogous to the deacons in the Pauline churches, in both cases the product of felt needs. In the Gentile churches, there developed from the *διακονία* of the *ἀπαρχαὶ* which, at first included functions both higher and lower, the two congregational offices of bishops and deacons, the first being the same as the presbyters in the Jewish churches. The names, however, soon became exchangeable, and the officers meant were at first identical. He rejects the theory, as groundless, that presbyters formed the general council, and bishops an official board within it. The fact that the congregational offices were charismatic opposes such views. Hence, after election by the people came in, respect for the charisma remained and men were officers for life. The work of this presbyter or bishop council was, direction of public worship, pastoral oversight, discipline, finance, and representation of the congregation abroad. The diaconate was an office of service, executive, especially to care for the poor. The work of teaching lay outside all these offices; the call to it was purely charismatic. We can see, however, the transfer of this office to the bishop-presbyters already in the Epistle to the Ephesians and the Shepherd; to bishops and deacons in the *didache*; and to one bishop in the Church Constitutions. The germ of the monarchical bishop, he finds, even in the Pastoral Epistles, especially in the duty of the bishop (singular) to represent sound teaching against error. “Those

letters show at the same time, that the change of the mere president, which the committee of presbyters must have had already a long time, into a regular moderator of the higher rank, had its roots in movements, which called forth the Gnostic danger." The functions assigned Timothy and Titus already outline the monarchical-congregational bishop. These with the Episcopal name in the singular, form the elements here, from the union of which arose the Catholic idea of a bishop. These bishops could be moderators of a congregation ; at the same time they might have a number of congregations, but with different congregational presbyteries, not with monarchial bishops, under them. These were the similarities and dissimilarities, as compared with the later metropolitans. As soon as the committee of elders saw in the bishop, not only a moderator of itself, but also the head of the whole congregation, a change arose in the mode of election ; he must be chosen as a well qualified official by the whole congregation, and now the choice was no longer limited to a particular circle, as the elders. A further result of the prominence of the bishop was a closer connection of the deacons or executive officers with him.

IV. CHRISTIAN LIFE—MONASTICISM.

With the decline of the school of Baur, who made primitive Christianity little more than an outgrowth of Essenism, the reaction has gone so far, that it now looks as if we may soon be told there was no such thing as an Essene known, when the Gospel was first preached. Ohle agrees with Lucius, that the Philonic writing *De Vita Contemplativa* is spurious, and its Therapeutae were Christian

monks; he then proceeds to show¹ that the sections in Philo's *Quod Omnis Probus Liber* (12-13), which speak of Essenes, were interpolated by the fabricator of the *De Vita*, and hence the Essenes "as representatives of pre-christian heresy in Israel are to be struck out of Church History." Like the supposed Therapeuta, they are simply fictitious pictures of Christian hermits, given a fancied existence among the Jews. He then turns to the "enigmatical Essenes of Josephus," and finds that the sections of this writer's works (*Bell. Jud.* ii, 8 and *Antiq.* xviii, 1), which represent Neo-Pythagorean Essenism, are also spurious; and we have left in Josephus only a few scattered notices of very simple Essenes. Hilgenfeld opposes this criticism, in behalf of *Quod Omnis*, as a genuine work of Philo, and the Essenes in it² as historical personages. So does Massebieau, who defends also the *De Vita* as a work of Philo.³ He thinks the Therapeutae were neither Christians, nor Neo-Pythagoreans, nor Buddhists; they were Jews, or Jewish philosophers, who retired for study, and formed a sort of brotherhood, which did not exist, however, much later than the time of Philo.

But it is not to groups of Jewish recluses that we must look for forecasts of Christian monasticism; heathen asceticism, especially in Egypt, forms a much nearer subject of comparison. The more minute the study into early monastic life, the more intimate the connection is found to be between the pagan anchorite and the Christian hermit. Amélineau has shown this afresh in a recent study

¹ *Jahrbücher f. Prot. Theologie*, 1887. Hh. 2, 3; 1888, H. 2.

² *Die Essäer Philo's*, in *Zfjt. f. wiss. Theologie*, 1888, H. 1.

³ *Revue de l'histoire des religions*. T. xvi, No. 2 & 3.

of Pachomius, the founder of the coenobite system in Egypt.¹ Returning as a conscript from the Roman army, this young Egyptian, having learned something of the Gospel, took possession of a ruined temple of Serapis on the Nile, and became a Christian hermit, though not yet a member of the Church. He had been won to the new faith by seeing the kindness of Christians to the poor and wretched. Finally some zealous believers took him to a church and baptized him “without the new convert (adepte) knowing what they did to him.” After three years he became a monk under an old ascetic, Palamon, with whom he remained seven years, till his thirtieth year, when he withdrew to Tabennisi, “the place of the palms of Isis,” where, after the manner of Egyptian heathen hermits, he became a Christian anchorite. Amélineau finds this Egyptian love of solitude a fruitful soil for both the Jewish Therapeutæ and the first Christian monks. The three stages of the ascetic life, (1) the spiritual recluse, though still in the midst of men, (2) the solitary hermit, and (3) hermits in groups, under rules, or monks, all appear in Egyptian heathenism, before the tendency ran through the same stages in Christian circles. Hermits, like Paul, Antony,² Macarius, and their followers, had already formed communities in the latter part of the third century; that was an advance, but now Pachomius proceeded

¹ *Étude historique sur St. Pachome et le cénobitisme primitif dans la Haute Égypte*, d'après les monuments Coptes, Paris, 1887.

² For a handy edition of the supposed *Life of St. Antony*, ascribed to Athanasius (see against this Farrar, in *Contemp. Review*, Nov. 1887, and Weingarten, l. e. p. 22), see *Vie de St. Antoine*, edited by Maunoury, Paris, Delagrave, 1887. Fr. 1. Has Greek Text, French notes, and Lexicon.

to a higher and more rational view of monastic life. Among the hermits that flocked about him, he established a period of probation, he refused to accept brothers from other monasteries, three were to occupy a cell together, prayers were not to be numerous but sincere, certain general rules were binding, but "in other respects, the great principle governing the new institution was that of individual liberty." A minimum of obligation was demanded of every monk, and that must be kept. Beyond that, each was free, provided general order was not disturbed. This was a great advance on the mechanical system that had spread among other Egyptian monks. Remembering his army experience, Pachomius divided his monks into sections, with an officer over each. There were regular classes for the instruction of the brothers, who numbered two thousand five hundred. Branch monasteries also arose, and the whole brotherhood soon included seven thousand men. Now Mary, the sister of Pachomius, visited him, and a monastery for women was founded, under the same rules as for men. Of the general character of these monks, Amélineau says, they were "at heart, far from true virtue," and from the nature of the case it could not be otherwise. "The great majority of them were simple *fellahin*, without education, or artisans of low class; all were by nature rude, gross, and of violent passions." "Almost all were eye-servers," who believed that their salvation was secured by the fact of their becoming monks, and the risks were great of merely formal piety. Jealousy arose between the Pachomian monks and those that stretched along the Libyan chain, and Pachomius spent all his time visiting among his monasteries to keep them pure.

The Coptic accounts give horrible details of the violence and licentious habits of many monks.

Sodomy was the crime most frequent among the Pachomian hermits ; among others, we hear of abortion, infanticide, and insubordination. Amélineau makes prominent the idea that Pachomius was Christian chiefly in name, so far as doctrines were concerned ; it was just the same with all Egypt, apart from Alexandria, where Greek culture met the Gospel. The Copts gradually became Christians, by means of monastic methods and ideals, hence bishops were never held in great respect, or the hierarchy honored as among the Greeks and Romans. “Even at the present day, a monk, who becomes a bishop, seems to be degraded.” “The true heroes and the true teachers of Christian Egypt were the martyrs and the monks, men drawn most frequently from the common people.” Theological questions never took hold of the native Egyptians. “Never in the Coptic writings does a prayer occur addressed to the Trinity, to Father, Son and Holy Spirit, except from some scholar like Sehnoudi.” The name of the Virgin Mary is not once mentioned in the lives of Pachomius, Macarius and Antony. “The Copts of the fourth century had only three sacraments, Baptism, the Lord’s Supper and Orders ; the others were unknown.” Along simpler lines of practical life, the transition was made from Pagan morals to Christian living. “One of the causes which hastened the Egyptian people into Christianity, was the horror, which the disciples of Christ had of Greek polytheism, which was equally odious to the children of the Nile valley.” And, on the other hand, not a little of the old Egyptian religion still lingered among

these Coptic Christians. Amélineau goes so far as to think that the common people in most cases did little more than put Jesus in place of Osiris, and go on as before.¹

V. CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

Alexandria was the center of the Hellenistic influences, which from the second century on, have left an abiding impression upon the Christian Church. Not only did Greek philosophy help mould the theology of the Early Church, but the methods and spirit of the Greek religion gave a perceptible coloring to the worship of the first Gentile believers. Bratke has just illustrated this with special reference to Clement of Alexandria and his relation to the ancient mysteries.² It is striking to see how very often he refers to the Greek mysteries, compared with his reference to the Old Testament and its mysteries. In only one respect does he exalt Mosaism, that is when he speaks of the wisdom of all other nations as drawn, directly or indirectly, from the Old Testament. In the history of religion, the Law and the Prophets held an important place, but for the Christian thinker their peculiarities were little more than matters of antiquarian interest. Clement calls Christ the high priest only once, but he frequently calls him a hierophant and mystagogue. Christianity, he regards, as the religion of the future. In it alone are the

¹ For an interesting picture of the life of an Irish Monk, of a generation later than Pachomius, cf. *The Writings of St. Patrick*, with Notes, etc. By Stokes and Wright. London : Nisbet & Co. 1887. 1s.

² *Die Stellung des Clemens Alexandrinus zum Antiken Mysterienwesen*, in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1887. II. 4.

true mysteries to be found; all others are delusions and vanity. This progressive faith must give, in its true worship, that peace, which pagans sought in vain at their own most secret shrines. So, to meet heathen gnosis and heathen mysteries, Clement tried to set forth Christian Gnosis and Christian Mysteries. From his knowledge of the Eleusinian, Dionysian, and some Oriental mysteries, which underlay the popular life of the time, both common and educated, he endeavored to lead men to a syneretic theology and worship of truth and virtue. He accepts two classes of men, those who wish to see the mysteries, and those who have no such desire. Few attain to esoteric truth. Religion is the highest good, and can be presented only allegorically, hence revelation must be allegorical. This principle Clement held in common with the mysteries. He also apprehended salvation, not as an act of God, but as taking place through the place of the mysteries itself. The highest good presented in the ancient rites was that of immortality; so, Clement puts it first. In both, too, is there the same way of appropriating salvation. The grades in the catechumenate of Clement are very similar also to those in the Eleusinian mysteries. The baptism at entrance occurs in each. Referring to the passage in the *Didache* on baptism, DeRossi says,¹ that the performance of this rite by pouring was by no means exceptional. The catacomb representations, he adds, agree with the oldest form in this matter. Beyond baptism, the third degree admitted to full membership in both Clement's plan and that of the mysteries. He regarded Chris-

¹ Cf. *Römische Quartalschrift*. Rome, 1888. H. 1.

tianity rather as a cult of mysteries than as theology. His whole terminology is colored by terms of initiation and esoteric suggestions, drawn from the mysteries. He knows of a secret tradition from Christ, such as the mysteries had from their founders. The whole life of the initiated one is regarded as an advance through catechumenate stages till at last the true gnostic reaches, as the goal, immortality, and the inner, secret, mysterious knowledge of God. Bratke sums up thus: "In his time appear the roots of that unevangelical perversion of Christian worship, which grew up, in the liturgy of the Greek and Roman Churches into a fully developed service of Mysteries and Sacrifices. In this respect a comparison shows, that all the constituent factors of divine worship, in both the Eastern and Western Churches, with exception of the hierarchical, appear systematically represented already in Clement of Alexandria, and that in conscious imitation of the cult of the ancient mysteries." Here, he thinks, is the origin largely of the Arcana Discipline, which has remained such a mystery until now.

A fragment of an Egyptian liturgy, dating from the third century, has just been brought to light by Bickell.¹ He translates it as follows: "He that was born in Bethlehem and reared up in Nazareth, who dwelt in Galilee, we have seen his sign from Heaven. When the star appeared the shepherds watching in the fields were astonished. Falling on their knees, they said, Glory be to the Father, Alleluia, glory be to the Son and to the Holy

¹ Cf. Stokes, *The Fayum Manuscripts*, in *The Expositor*, June, 1888. Gleanings from *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer*. Vienna, 1887.

Ghost, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia." Such praise was accepted in those days, when there were no Arians to object to equal glory paid to Father, Son and Spirit, and no Athanasian party to oppose the insertion of "Alleluia" between the name of the Father, and that of the Son.¹

VI. ART IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

Bennett finds the study of early Christian art shed light upon the mistakes of chronology, upon false ideas respecting the first Christians, and their supposed aversion to art; it improves patristic texts, it enlarges our knowledge of early heresies—e. g. Gnostic teachings traced in illustrations found on gems—and it gives much general unconscious information on the life of the Church.² The relation of Early Christianity to art, he finds influenced by Judaism, which was not favorable to representative art; hence, only gradually did the love of art, which was strong in the Graeco-Roman world, press into the service of the Church. Converts of education and refinement brought their aesthetic tastes with them into the Church, and art became more and more a handmaid of religion. The heathen models were followed, but, Bennett says, "the early employment of symbolism indicates the chariness of the Church in the use of free statuary and painting." He

¹ For a valuable handbook, giving the *History of Christian Worship*, in the Early, the Mediaeval, the Modern Church, the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches, see Köstlin, *Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes*, Freiburg i. B., Mohr, 1887.

² *Christian Archaeology*. Cincinnati. Cranston & Stowe, 1888. The first American book on this subject, and a most useful work.

finds such symbolism as Jesus the Vine, or the Shepherd, naturally preceding literal representations taken from the Scriptures. The Church of the first three centuries took pagan art into her service, just as she took heathen philosophy to express her doctrines, and the Roman State to build up her hierarchy.

He thinks the school represented by Hasenclever¹ "errs by its lacks," as that of De Rossi does by its excesses. He takes a middle way, which recognizes the influence of contemporary heathen art, but also sees the powerful influence of Biblical history and admits a measure of symbolic art originated in the Early Church. This view he applies to the origin of the first church structures. He regards the oblong Christian basilica as a composite growth, from the ordinary Roman dwelling, the triclinia of the mansion, the ancient club room, and the more imposing law basilica. These suggestive forms were used by the new religion and fitted to its growing needs.

How wide a field of research is here opened up to the student has been set forth afresh by Victor Schultze, in an article on *The present state of Ecclesiastical-archæological Research*,² in which he says there are about fifty ancient cemeteries in Rome, and the number of early Christian inscriptions found there now reaches fifteen thousand, so that De Rossi has been able to found the new science of Epigraphies. Most of the inscriptions come from cemeteries, which are also full of antique objects. In recent years, at St. Agnese, near Rome, 5,735 graves have been opened, and 283 glass and enamelled articles, 33 clay ves-

¹ Cf. *Current Discussions*. Vol. v. p. 172. 1888.

² In *Ztg. f. Kirchl. Wiss. u. K. Leben.* 1888, H. 6.

sels, 131 lamps, 148 bone rings, 29 coins, and many other things taken out. The work of excavation is going on also in North Africa. Schultze praises a work by Franz,¹ but joins issue with Pohl,² who holds the traditional view, that art in the Church took only parts from antique decorative painting; "from the beginning on decidedly Christian pieces appear." But Schultze maintains that, in the first century, Christians used purely heathen art, and only gradually on this basis did there grow up a proper Christian art. He notices Heinrici's theory, that the cycle of representations in the catacombs was closely connected with the New Testament circle of thought, which saw all life and hope in Christ; and admits its correctness in general, but holds that it must be given more definiteness and limitation to suit the particular case here, viz., that of life in Christ continuing beyond the grave. Of Hasenclever's view, that the symbolical came into Christian art as a secondary matter, and as a mere attachment to ornamental figures, Schultze holds that would make Christian art mere copying and a chapter of accidents. The work of Liell³ opposes these views of Schultze, who had said⁴ "the cultus of Mary, in the proper sense of the word, cannot be proven from the monuments before the fifth century," and "the testimony of the catacombs shows more than all else the enormous contrast between Early Christianity and

¹ *Geschichte der christlichen Malerei.* Freiburg, 1887.

² *Die altchristliche Fresko und Mosaik-Malerei.* Leipzig, 1888.

³ *Die Darstellungen der allerseligsten Jungfrau und Gottesgebärerin Mariæ auf den Kunstdenkmalen der Katakomben.* Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1887. M. 10.50.

⁴ *Archäologische Studien.* 1880.

modern Romanism."¹ Liell says Schultze's theological prejudice makes him do violence to facts and monuments. He admits, however, himself that the term "holy," so common later, was not applied to Mary in the second century, much less in the first, and the "worship" of the Virgin then he only infers; what he proves is what all believe, that Christ, the Son of God, was born of a Virgin. He begins his study with the pictures of Orants, which, he holds, are neither ornamental figures, nor portraits, but symbols, in some cases the portrait being also regarded. Some of the forms, he thinks, must represent the Virgin Mary. The key to explanations of Bible scenes depicted, he finds in the liturgical prayers for death-beds and funerals. He follows the usual Roman Catholic theory of symbolism, and the ecclesiastical theological supervision of the artists by the Early Church. He says "early Christian art was something original," and differed in every respect from all other art. Here the saying "*un art ne s'improvise pas*" has no application, so far as the contents of the representation is concerned.

Turning to the *Roman Quarterly for Christian Antiquities and Church History*,¹ a Roman Catholic publication, we meet much valuable information, illustrated by some very excellent photographic reproductions. In recent numbers, Kirsch describes² a seal of the sixth century, the oldest lead seal known, which bears a picture of Christ's baptism. The Saviour stands naked, apparently on the edge of Jordan; the Baptist is on the right of Jesus, with his hand stretched out over the Lord's head; an

¹ Rome, 1887-88. (German).

² 1887. H. 2.

angel stands on the opposite side of Jordan; while over the Saviour's head is the dove.

Wilpert describes¹ a recently discovered fresco of Abraham offering Isaae, and proceeds, upon the Roman Catholic theory, to explain it as a type of the offering of Christ.

De Waal² treats the interesting subject of *The Apocryphal Gospels in Early Christian Art*. He defends the use of them, partly, by holding that they contain some matter of historic value. Their influence is seen, he thinks, in the picture of Christ as a child a year old when the Magi appeared, by other gifts than gold, frankincense and myrrh, by the ox and the ass at the birth of Christ, the Nativity in a cave, the Virgin making cloth when the angel appeared, the boy Jesus always accompanied by four angels, the virginity of Mary declared by the priests, the coming of an astronomer to Jesus, the soldier who pierced Jesus being called Longinus. De Waal thinks the influence of such writings cannot be traced farther back than the fourth century. He concludes with these words of De Rossi: "The monuments of the first three or four centuries, especially the Roman, bear testimony to the Canonical Books, and not to the Apocryphal. But in the fifth century, when, without danger to the authority of the Four Gospels, artists could be allowed to follow certain traditions, which are from the Apocrypha, the use of these began in Christian art."³

We are learning also that the story in the Acts of the

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*

³ For further general illustrations, cf. Stokes, *Early Christian Art in Ireland*. Chapman & Hall. London, 1887. 7s. 6d.

Martyrs about a certain John and Paul dying in the time of Julian the Apostate, their home having stood where the church, later built in their honor, was erected ; that they were put to death in their own house and buried there, is all correct, for recent explorations have uncovered the Roman house of the fourth century with part of it turned into a church. Further digging has exposed the Tablinum,¹ in which, besides the usual decorative frescoes, Christian paintings appear, a female orant, Moses putting off his shoes, etc. This discovery is of great interest, for it is the first known example of representations of a positively Christian character in a Roman house. It confirms the statement ascribed to Leo the Great, that the martyrs John and Paul were the only ones, who, in spite of the Roman law to the contrary, were buried in the heart of the city. It is perhaps significant that not till the fourth century do we find Christian houses decorated with frescoes ; it may reflect the fact that most Christians, before that time, belonged to the poorer classes, whose homes had very little decoration, either Christian or heathen. From this point of view, at all events, does Marignan say² that the whole subject of early Christian Art should be approached. He accuses Le Bland and Schultze of interpreting primitive art from the pages of the Fathers, and not, as they should, from the life of the common people ; for there was a great variety of interpretation of common symbols in ordinary life. We must, he says, read the lessons of early art from a study of the general

¹ Cf. Germano, *Das Haus der h. Märtyrer Johannes u. Paulus*, in *Röm. Quartalschrift*. 1888, H. 2.

² *La foi chrétienne au quatrième siècle*. Paris. Picard. 1887.

society that composed the Church, and not from the limited hints found in literary references. The art of the catacombs was for the common man, not for the aristocracy of thought; so it must be looked at with the eyes of the humble worshipper, not in the light of the rhetoric of Ambrose or Jerome. Hence the miracles of Jesus in painting cannot be interpreted symbolically; they must be taken naturally. Such scenes must be looked at as a people still superstitious, still under Pagan influences looked at them, both in making and admiring them. Before A.D. 313, the Church consisted largely of Jews and Orientals, and the simple Jewish ritual was followed. The art was not doctrinal nor symbolical, neither of God nor of the great Heaven. It was a deep reverence for the dead and for them only. The catacombs, he says, were no place for didactics. Christian art, he continues, was not original, but was a continuation of that of the heathen. Before A.D. 313, it was purely decorative. "No dogma has been found yet in the catacombs." The artists were trained in great schools, and worked, very likely, for both pagans and Christians.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES.¹

I. HISTORY OF THE PAPACY.

The old view, that the Church, which entered the fifth century with an ascetic renunciation of the world, as a leading principle, gradually proceeded to claim rule over the world, led by mere ambition and a hypocritical hierarchy, is now pretty generally given up by scholars. What, then, was the relation in the Middle Ages of the asceticism, which ruled in monasticism, and the spirit of world-rule that controlled the papacy? Eicken points out² that these two tendencies were at heart one, and the transition from one to the other followed the logic of the religious system. The world might be under the feet of the Church, both as sinful and as serving. A network of Canon Law appeared, which was to embrace all the moral relations of men both as Christians and as citizens. Allen finds the key to the secrets of the whole Canonical system to lie in this,³ "that deep in the consciousness or the con-

¹ A good popular narrative, from a Quaker point of view, is *Witnesses for Christ and Memorials of Church Life*, iv–xiii cent. By Backhouse & Tylor. 2 Vols. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1887. Adorned by beautiful illustrations.

² *Geschichte und System der mittelalterlichen Weltanschauung*. Stuttgart. 1887. M. 12.

³ *Canon Law as a Factor in Christian Civilization*, in *The Unitarian Review*.

science of the Early Church lay the conviction of its divine mission to save the world by means of a new or divine order of society; as we should say at this day, by a social reconstruction on the foundation laid in the gospel." Hence arose all those laws and systems of government for individuals, society, and nations. Every power on earth was to serve the will of God, as expressed in His Church. Constantine called himself a bishop for the Church in temporal affairs, so we can readily believe that Pope Stephan II. might well invent the Donation of Constantine, A.D. 753, when he entered into communication with Pepin of France.¹ Karl Müller supports Weiland in denying that this forgery in behalf of the Papacy was of Frankish origin.² It was, very likely, of Roman workmanship, and simply sought to show that the increasing power of the bishop of Rome, which was a result of the removal of the emperor to Constantinople, was part of a plan of the first Christian Caesar to secure the power and independence of the Papacy. Such a removal of the seat of empire had, however, an element of danger for the Roman bishop in the great dignity and power given the bishop of the new capital. Hence the well known objection of Gregory I. to the title of Universal Patriarch ascribed to John the Faster. Gelzer has recently investigated this question afresh,³ and finds that from the fifth

rian Review. Oct. 1887. Cf. *The Elements of Canon Law*. By O. J. Reichel. London: Bosworth. 1887.

¹ The view of Hauck, in *Ztft. f. Kirchl. Wiss. u. K. Leben*, 1888. H. 4.

² See *Ztft. f. Kirchengeschichte*, 1887. H. 3.

³ *Der Streit über den Titel des ökumenischen Patriarchen*, in *Jahrb. f. Protest. Theologie*, 1887. H. 4.

to the eighth century every patriarch signed himself simply Episcopos, so John introduced no novelty. It is true he, like his predecessors, was called Ecumenical Patriarch, and regarded himself as on an equality with the Patriarch of Rome; but he did not use the title as an individual dignity, as the patriarchs of the Middle Ages did, neither was he moved by hierarchic ambition. Roman charges to the contrary rest on an Isidorian forgery.¹

The chief points in the development of the Papacy in Germany, Weingarten (l. c.) finds to be, (1) The founding of the two great powers of the Middle Ages, the Carolingian Empire, and the new civil place assumed by the Papacy. (2) After the fall of the Carolingian power, A.D. 900 to 1046, the suppression of the idea of Church unity through the opposition of different nations. The Papacy in its ecclesiastical isolation was now on the way to become a family possession of the Roman nobility. This secularization of the Papacy, introduced by Alberich, was interrupted by the intervention, A.D. 963, of Otto of Germany. (3) The regeneration of the Papacy which took place through its connection with Cluny, the first narrower concentration in the Benedictine Order. This Order was, in the tenth and eleventh century, the chief representative of the idea of reform in the Church through subordination to the Papacy. Hence the monks of Cluny were defenders of the hierarchy of Gregory VII., who fought for the supremacy of the Papacy over the Empire. Fetzer shows² that Nicholas II., made pope by Hilde-

¹ For Gregory's views, see *Epistolarum tomus I, pars I, Gregorii I. papae registrum epistolarum*, Liber i-iv. Ed. P. Ewald. Berlin. 1887. M. 9.

² *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Geschichte des Pontifikats Alexanders II.* A Dissertation. 1887.

brand in opposition to Benedict, chosen by the Romans, made an agreement with the emperor, before he was made pope, by which he renewed the rights of Patrician to the monarch as the price of his recognition. He shows further that the decree of this pontiff, giving cardinal bishops sole power of initiative and presidency at papal elections, was aimed indirectly against imperial influence, though it was not this edict, but the bestowal of Lower Italy on the Normans that led to the breach between Nicholas and the emperor.

Weingarten (l. e.) says that it was the Investiture controversy that brought the struggle for the independence of the Church, and her worldly possessions, from the State into prominence. With the Concordat of Worms, the Church gained a victory in having her essential independence from the State formally fixed; this emancipation was a prerequisite to the battle of the Papacy for supremacy over the Empire. With the reception of the ring and staff the Papacy had received a right which it had never before had in Germany. In the conflict that followed the emperor was defeated by the pope, and then the scene of battle was transferred to France. Here Boniface VIII. took very high ground. His bull *Unam Sanctam* declared plainly¹ that the State is to be subject to the Church. In our days the popes have been declared infallible, and all their bulls, past and present, must also be considered infallible; hence, Berchtold says, every good Catholic is now called upon to accept the bull of Boniface as an article of faith in the nineteenth century. This edict, he

¹ Cf. Berchtold, *Die Bulle Unam Sanctam*, Munich, Kaiser. 1887.

shows, is through and through a dogmatic statement, and hence all hope of a permanent peace between the Modern State and the Vatican Catholic Church must be forever given up. One or other must yield, for this bull closes thus: "Therefore we declare . . . that it is absolutely necessary to salvation, that every human creature [*i. e.* every human government] shall be subject to the Roman Pope." Such high claims to absolute authority over both Church and State increased rather than diminished when the successors of Boniface had their home for seventy years in France, and, while satisfactory to the French king, could exalt the claims of Christ's Vicar as high as they chose over all the rest of Christendom. These seventy years of papal assumption were followed by thirty years of papal schism, two, sometimes three vicars of Christ infallibly guiding the distracted Church. The Catholic idea of Church unity, upon which mediaeval Christianity was built, seemed about to be lost. The popes could offer no help, so by common consent an appeal was made to a General Council. It became the period of great councils, Pisa, Constance, Basle, from 1414 to 1443. Upon the history of this time and that immediately succeeding, the well-known work of Hefele, continued by Hergenröther, continues to shed light from a Roman Catholic point of view.¹ The present volume embraces the period from the conclusion of the Council of Basle till the imperial election of 1519. Besides the General Councils of Pisa [2d.] and the Fifth Lateran, it includes a large number of Provincial

¹ *Konziliengeschichte*. Nach den Quellen bearbeitet von Hefele; fortgesetzt von Kardinal Hergenröther. Vol. viii. Freiburg i. B. Herder. 1887.

and Diocese synods. Nearly half the work is taken up with the general history of the period. The writer admits the sins of the popes, also the insufficiency of the measures for reform, even at the Lateran Council; but he cannot utter a word in favor of the opponents of the Curia or the Papacy, while with such movements as the Waldenses he has no sympathy whatever. Valuable documents are given from the papal archives relating to the dispute between the bishops and the Orders at the Lateran Council, the opposition of the university of Paris, and the attempt at union with the Maronites. The fulness of material respecting all the councils, great and small, of the period treated makes the volume valuable for all students of pre-Reformation Church history. These so-called Reform Councils of the fifteenth century healed the schism in the Church, and, though they did not work immediate improvement, started and intensified free thought among educated men, which led to an opposition, both official and non-official, to papal wrong doing, which reached final expression in the Revolution commonly called the Reformation. It is significant that Erfurt, the University of Luther, had the largest representation at the Council of Basle. It is also important to find a large part of the most earnest monastic order, the Franciscans, failing to support the pope. The life of Matthias Döring illustrates this.¹ He was a young German. He studied in Oxford under Wielf, and learned the English ideas of independence. He returned to Germany where he met, especially at Erfurt, Husite currents of thought. He became a theological teacher in his Order, and, in 1431, was made com-

¹ Cf. an article by Gebhardt, in *Hist. Zeitschrift*, 1888. H. 2.

missioner to reform the “Bare Foot Monastery” in Eisenach. He was also one of the Reform delegates from Erfurt to the Council of Basle. His attack upon the despotism of the pope¹ shows how strong was the opposition of the “Conventuals” among the Franciscans to the “Observants” and the pope. We learn also how sadly the German monasteries had declined at the beginning of the fourteenth century.²

We hear then, too, of a change for the better. Busch, a pupil of Gerhard Groot, labored to make Windesheim a model monastery. Besides pure living, the Bible was revised, Church Fathers copied, and Latin works translated into German for the use of the people. Busch’s book on *The Reform of Monasteries*, which appeared 1475, shows how many earnest souls in Germany were praying for better things before Luther was born. These serious Germans kept on thinking that it must be all right in Rome; and if the sins and crimes of the Church were brought to the knowledge of the pope an improvement must take place. But the Papacy grew worse instead of better. When Luther was an infant, there reigned a pope called Innocent VIII., “who might well be named father in Rome, for he had sixteen bastard children.” After him came Alexander VI., one of whose five children, Caesar Borgia, is the subject of a recent study by Yriarti.³ Caesar “was a fifteen year old prelate.” A letter is here pub-

¹ *Confutatio primatus papæ*, written 1438.

² See *Des Augustiner-Probstes J. Busch Chronicon Windesheimense, etc.* von Grube. Halle: O. Hendel. 1887.

³ *Cæsar Borgia I. The Cardinal of Valentia.* *Blackwood's Magazine*, Dec. 1887.

lished for the first time, from the cardinal father of Cæsar, supporting a bull of Innocent, which made the boy a bishop. Twenty days after his father became pope, the lad was made cardinal of Valentia. His income now was over 16,000 ducats. Besides this, he had 30,000 a year from the Church of S. Michele, with income also from two other Churches. He was now made legitimate, as an ambassador said, "because he was born in the lifetime of his mother's husband," though his mother's husband was not his father. Cæsar's crimes, Yriarti says, were not the result of passion; "each is one link of a chain in a well defined scheme. It is this element of premeditation which makes the Duke of Valentinois a great historical character, in spite of all that he had to leave unfinished." Lucretia, his sister, was, "a docile instrument in the hands of the Borgias." It was the anger of her first husband, Pesaro, at her loss that led him to charge her father and brothers with incestuous intercourse with her.

II. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

"We wish, in connection with a new work on this subject,¹ to turn the attention of students and pastors to the interesting and profitable field of instruction and illustration afforded by the history of the Scottish Church. The full account of the Celtic Church in Ireland and its transference to Scotland as given by Bellesheim, a scholarly

¹ *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland.* From the Introduction of Christianity to the Present Day. By A. Bellesheim. Translated by D. O. Hunter Blair. Vols. i and ii. From the Dawn of Christianity to the Suppression of the Catholic Religion, A.D. 1560. W. Blackwood and Sons. Edinburgh. 1887.

and liberal German Catholic writer, and translated by a Scotch monk of learning and good spirit, is a very instructive work, and gives the most complete history of the Catholic Church of Scotland with which we are acquainted. The author thinks that Christianity reached Britain as early as the first century. It spread rapidly because there was no persecution here until that under Diocletian. The earliest missionary to Scotland was Ninian, whom our author makes the pope send out; this information he derives from the unreliable life of the saint written by Aelred in the twelfth century. Following Skene, he finds it doubtful if Palladius was ever in Scotland, much less the missionary successor there of Ninian. The work of these early laborers came to an end, and the Scotch lapsed again almost entirely into paganism. Then came the Irish monks, who introduced the monastic period of Scottish Church history, which lasted until the middle of the ninth century, "when it gave way to the Culdees, who were succeeded in their turn, about the eleventh century, by the ordinary constitution of the Church," that is by the Roman system. Bellesheim traces three periods in the development of the Irish Church: (1) the time of the secular clergy, that is non-monkish ministers, (2) that of a regular or monastic clergy, and (3) that of an eremitical clergy. In the first period, there was no such thing as a diocesan bishop. Patrick put a bishop in every Church that he founded. Bellesheim thinks that the great number of bishops arose because every tribe wanted to have a bishop of its own. He says there were several priests under each bishop; and yet we read of Patrick ordaining "seven times fifty holy bishops, and three hundred priests,"

as if there were as many bishops as priests. Angus the Culdee speaks further of one hundred and fifty-three groups of seven bishops each. There is no trace of archbishops in the Church of Patrick. Most of the Irish bishops were of British or Frankish origin.

The monastic period followed the time of Patrick, monachism coming from two sources, from St. Ninian's monastery at Whithern, in Galloway, and from Brittany and Wales. This monastic movement revived the decayed Church founded by Patrick, sent Columba to Scotland, and led towards the regular mediaeval Church system. It was succeeded by the Culdees, in the eighth century, who took the place of the Columban monks, who were driven out of the Pictish lands in 717. These Culdees were hermits, who were brought gradually under canonical rule, and gave rise to a hermit clergy. This new order of priests arose under the influence of the Roman Church, and gradually superseded the Columban monks in Eastern and Southern Scotland. This anchorite clergy appeared in Scotland about the same time that we first hear of the secular clergy, and both helped to change the monastic Celtic Church into a Roman dioecesan Church. It is admitted that the change to the non-monastic and more Roman system led to concubinage and immorality among the clergy. Skene says, however, that clerical marriages were not unlawful before 1130.

The marriage of the clergy was soon followed by hereditary succession to benefices in the families of the clergy. This evil was wide-spread. The death of King Maebeth, 1057, and the Norman Conquest were followed by the end of the monastic period of the Scottish Church.

Parish churches appear under Edgar in Scotland [d. 1107]. His brother Alexander set himself to introduce into Scotland the Roman system of dioecesan and parochial organization, as found in England, in place of the monastic system, which had prevailed for centuries. Instead of the Culdees there arose a host of monks from the regular orders, that soon took possession of the kingdom. The history then moves on towards the Reformation in Scotland. Our author says this movement spread because of "the mechanical pressure of external force, aided by the circumstances of time and place," and not because of "the intrinsic vitality of the new doctrines." The martyrdom of Protestants is admitted, but, we are told, the Church was not to blame. "It must be remembered that these severe measures were not dictated by a spirit of persecution. They were the logical carrying out of a principle which had been recognized from the earliest times in every country of Christendom—namely, the right and duty of the secular arm to draw the sword in defence of the Church." The causes assigned for the spread of the Reformation in Scotland are : (1) the corruption and worldliness of many of the clergy ; (2) the dense ignorance of the people in religious things, because neglected by the priests ; (3) the greed of the nobles ready to plunder the Church under the name of Reform ; (4) the author lays stress upon the Revival of Letters among the Scotch, to show that the Roman Church favors learning, he might rather have classed it as a fourth cause of the growth of Protestantism. Throughout the course of this instructive work the writer seeks to leave the impression that the Scottish people would have been much more

prosperous had they remained in the Roman Church. A most significant comparison is near at hand. The Irish people continued within the Roman communion; will any man say that Catholic Ireland can compare in all the elements of national prosperity with Protestant Scotland? The contrast is the more striking inasmuch as until the time of Knox the Irish were in most respects far in advance of their Scottish neighbors.

III. HISTORY OF DOCTRINE AND SECTS.

The Germanic apprehension of Christianity in the Middle Ages has been set forth recently by Seeberg.¹ Gregory of Tours represents God as an active personality, and to do wonders is most natural for him. A Germanic element in his Nicene Christology appears in his opposing Arianism by declaring Christ to be our end and aim, who, if we turn to him, will in his gentle pity give us eternal life. It is the position of the German king and his subjects. Gregory knows of the death of Christ, but why did he die? Gregory does not make his death a central doctrine; he speaks of it from the point of view of the wickedness of the Jews. Christ the king, and not Christ the crucified one, was his prominent thought. He delivers us from foes, gives us life, dwells in us, saves the saints and punishes the ungodly.

The Anglo-Saxons represent God also as a great king, surrounded in Heaven by his armies; the devil was a rebellious vassal, who through envy corrupted mankind.

¹ *Die Germanische Auffassung des Christenthums in dem früheren Mittelalter*, in *Ztft. f. Kirchl. Wiss. u. K. Leben.* 1888. Hh. 2-3.

The son of the monarch, Christ, then delivered man from the enemy. The crucifixion is set forth, but it is Christ the Hero, not Christ, the Lamb, that is celebrated. He died to show his love. The call to Christ is to enter the army of the Lord, and obey his commands. Love must be answered with gratitude. The lost perish, not because of unbelief in the crucified Lord, but because of their ingratitude. Their great Captain died for his men; their duty was loving service to him. Besides delivering us, Christ has taught us by word and example; hence a German poet summed up Christian life in living God's truth, forsaking evil, and showing humility before pride.

The drift in the thought of the Church, in the Middle Ages, was more and more a mystical and mysterious setting forth of salvation as something received from God by means of the Church and its peculiar rites and ceremonies. The Lord's Supper, especially, became the center of this mysterious communication of divine favors. All the early Fathers spoke of it as in some sense a sacrifice; Gregory I. decided it was an expiatory sacrifice; then Paschasius Radbertus, in the ninth century, advanced the theory of transubstantiation, that the bread and wine became the very body and blood of Christ, and were offered in the mass as Christ was offered on Calvary. Through much controversy this view prevailed, though not till Berengar of Tours made a second effort, in the eleventh century, to restore the doctrines of Augustine and Jerome. The quarrel, which now broke out, Schwabe finds,¹ arose, not from an earlier heresy of Berengar's, but from the dis-

¹ *Studien zur Geschichte des zweiten Abendmahlstreits.* Leipzig, 1887.

pute between him and Lanfrank in 1050. The Papacy desired neither to condemn nor justify Berengar, but the enemies of Leo IX made use of the charge of heresy to worry the pope. Hildebrand left the question of the Supper open. Policy, not doctrine, was the chief thing. Finally, at the Lateran Council, 1079, Gregory VII. "put his conscience in his pocket and went over to the transubstantiation party, to be sure at least of a majority." He was in this matter neither great nor powerful, but, like other popes, a man of expediency. Thus the Church became in many respects more priestly, more sacramentalian, more formal and scholastic in its theology, more hierarchical and despotic in its government. As the Early Church grew secular, from union with the classic Roman Empire, so did the Church of the Middle Ages become worldly and cold from too close fellowship with the German Empire. A reaction showed itself, from the thirteenth century on, against this increasing corruption and priestly system, and towards a pietism or mysticism which sought in the prayers and communion of a few godly brothers that peace which the formal Church could not afford. A recent book presents¹ again the most prominent manifestation of this tendency in the fourteenth century, as connected with the names of Tauler, Nicholas of Basle, and Henry Suso. In the extracts from the glowing, ecstatic sermons of these men of God, here given, we can see how just along the Rhine, and elsewhere in Germany, the soil that afterwards most gladly received the seeds of the Reformation was that which had been watered by the

¹ Cf. Bevan. *Three Friends of God, Etc.* London. J. Nesbit & Co., 1887. 5s.

tears of these so-called mystics. In their circles the priesthood of all believers, so much emphasized by Luther, found practical illustration, for here men and women, priests and monks, nuns and peasants met together, and without altar or confessional, sacrament or sanctuary, poured forth their prayers, and exhortations and blessings as the Spirit of God moved each glad heart.

The circumstances which gave rise to Mysticism within the Church led to the appearance of heretical sects beyond her pale. The chief of these were the Albigenses.¹ We now know that they were not the same as the Waldenses; neither were they good Protestants, as has been sometimes stated. The Inquisition charged them with such black crimes that it needed recent investigation to show the utter groundlessness of the accusation of immorality and night orgies among them.

Molinier has discovered a manuscript in the Vatican, which contains the trials of 904 such heretics, between A. D. 1318 and 1325, by Fournier, bishop of Paniers, afterwards Benedict XI. In it we meet many a sad case of men of pure life convicted of heresy by means of deceit and treachery, and punished accordingly. The investigation of early Waldensian literature is still going on. Karl Müller continues to hold² that we have no pre-Husite Waldensian writings. He is opposed by Montet,³ Preger⁴ and Comba.⁵

¹ Molinier. *Études sur quelques Manuscrits des Bibliothèques d'Italie concernant l'Inquisition et les Croyances hérétiques du XIII au XVII Siècle.* Paris, 1887. See, in general, Lea. *History of the Inquisition.* 1887-88. New York. 2 vols.

² *Theol. Literaturzeitung.* 1888. No. 16.

IV. MONASTIC ORDERS.

The study of the Middle Ages continues with growing activity, and the general tendency of investigators, we are told,¹ is to "translate this period from the monastic into the Secular." And yet this widening research still leaves the monasteries very near the heart of the religious life of those days. Even worldly business received valuable impulse from the intelligence and industry of the monks. The German monasteries, in the early Middle Ages, as has just been pointed out, took the place largely of the modern bank.² They supplied the need of money, and did an unselfish and valuable service, until the church reforms of the eleventh century stopped such loans as usury, and the Jews became the bankers of Germany. The idea that it was as right to hire money as anything else, could not be entertained, because the Old Testament had forbidden a Jew to take usury from his brother in his need. But the German Israelite might take usury, according to the Scriptures, from him that was not his brother, in this case the Christian, and so the Jews became, and have continued to be, the money lenders of Europe. Such a mechanical, legalistic view of life must necessarily produce Pharisaism

³ *La Noble Leçon.* Texte original d'après le manuscrit de Cambridge. Paris, 1888.

⁴ *Abhandl. d. königl. Bayer. Akademie der Wiss.* 3. Kl. 18. Bd. I Abth.

⁵ *Histoire des Vandois d'Italie, Etc.* Vol. 1. Paris, 1887.

¹ Cf. *Mittheilungen aus der historischen Litteratur.* Herausgegeben von d. hist. Gesellschaft in Berlin. 1887. H. 4.

² *Zur Geschichte der Juden Deutschlands,* in *Zfjt. f. die Gesch. der Juden in Deutschland.* I, 1.

in the Church; and in monks and clergy, as prominent professors of right living, such formality would naturally reach its most characteristic manifestation. The impossibility of keeping the law led to hypocrisy, and hypocrisy was followed by open indulgence of sin; then came a reaction, and earnest men demanded reform. Men like Waldo sought reform outside of the Church; Francis of Assisi tried to effect it within the Church. Weingarten says (*l. c.*), that the fundamental idea in his first rule, that of 1209, was the perfect following of the poor life of Christ. He founded a beggar Order, based on the example of Christ, who "lived from alms himself, as did the Blessed Virgin and his disciples." Every brother was absolutely forbidden to receive or have more than the means of subsistence. Joined to this idea of absolute following of Christ, was that of submission to the Church as sole representative of the Divine on earth. The second chief command of the Order Francis, like Waldo, drew from the first; it was the rule of apostolic preaching of repentance and peace. From 1216 on, Franciscan missionaries went forth preaching among Mohammedans and others. On this point Ehrle criticises¹ Müller's date for the beginning of Franciscan missions in Europe. He thinks they began about 1217 or 1218. He also opposes the view, that the formation of regular monasteries, instead of the homeless, itinerant life of the first Franciscans, and the regular organization of the Order was, as Müller holds, a departure from the original aim of the Society. It was rather, he maintains, a realization of the ideal followed by

¹ *Controversen über die Anfänge des Minoritenordens*, in *Ztsl. f. Katholische Theologie*, 1887, H. 11.

Francis himself. The struggle between the Community and the Spirituals lasted for eight years, and then the latter were crushed, A.D. 1317–18, though a goodly number remained, waiting for a chance to renew the conflict. The two poles in the controversy, about the time of the Vienne council, were the writings of Olivi, and the reform of discipline in the Order.¹ Of the Fraticelli, as the Spirituals were usually called, Ehrle says:² “In the oldest documents known to me the designation of Fraticelli is applied to the group of Spirituals, which was led at first by Liberatus, and later by Angelus of Clareno, and is not, as has been held hitherto, a designation of an illegal formation, a sect or sects, standing in no connection whatever with the Franciscans proper.” The Spirituals of South France, who left the Order after the controversy of 1317, were not called Fraticelli. Neither was Pimeliori, nor Segarelli, whom Ehrle finds to have been the founder of the Apostolie Brothers, who appeared after 1260, nor Dolcino, nor their followers called Fraticelli. The heretical Fraticelli, he holds, were not actual members of the Order, but had left it or been expelled. Various groups of such Fraticelli appeared.

Ehrle sums up his results as follows: The name Fraticelli meant (1) a sect which troubled the Church in Italy in the fourteenth and fifteenth century. Its founders were extreme Spirituals, who after the Council of Vienne, and in the early years of the pontificate of John XXII. sepa-

¹ Ehrle, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Concils von Vienne*, in *Archiv f. L. u. Kirch. Gesch. des Mittelalters*, 1887. Hh. 1, 2. See also his article on Olivi, *ibid.* Vol. iii, Hh. 3, 4, 1887.

² *Die Spiritualen*, *ibid.* Vol. iv, Hh. 1, 2, 1888.

rated from the Order and the Church, and formed independent groups of pseudo-religious societies. They set the absolute Minorite poverty on a level with the Evangelical life of the Saviour and the Apostles, and put the rules of Francis side by side with the Gospel; hence they regarded the decretals of pope John as heretical, and considered themselves the only true Franciscans. Full of the prophetic dreams of Joachim, they looked for the election of a Fraticelli pope, and through him the reform of the Church by means of the Fraticelli.

(2) Orthodox members of Orders were also sometimes called by this name, but more frequently pious people were so designated, who lived as hermits, outside of the monastic communities.

(3) Hence the heretical Fraticelli are to be distinguished from the Apostolic Brothers, founded by Segarelli and Dolcino, from the Beghines and Beghards of South France and Germany, and also from the Spirituals, for these last were the zealous advocates of poverty, who remained in the Order. Only in South France was there an exception to this. Weingarten (*l. c.*) also emphasizes the far-reaching influence of the Franciscan Order in the Middle Ages, upon which Ehrle is shedding such continuous light. He follows Denifle in finding the beginnings of German Mysticism appearing under the influence of the early Franciscans. Its first home, he also admits, was in female cloisters. Of Master Eckhart he says, "his speculative system is much less peculiar and important than was his psychological deepening of personal piety and making it more inward" (p. 121). He points out that Tauler was a pupil of Eckhart. Finally, he discovers, that German

Pietism and the principles of the Moravian Brethren are “the last fruit of that piety of the heart, proceeding from inmost personal life communion with Christ, which sprang from the original Franciscan System.” If we understand that modern Methodism is indirectly a result of the work of the Moravian Brethren, a wonderful line of religious movement opens up before us—Wesley’s work, German Pietism, Catholic Mysticism, and, back of all, Francis with his bands of workers seeking above all things to improve the condition of the sick and the poor.¹ Such monastic communities were always a witness to the equality and brotherhood of all believers, for here prince and peasant were on a level. It is not accidental, then, that we now hear that Philip of France set himself to destroy the Templar Order because it was a chief obstacle to his despotic ideas.² These knight-monks were not heretics, Schottmüller asserts, and their death was “nothing but a murder commanded by the king from motives of expediency.” There was, however, something inconsistent in a monk mounted upon a war horse, and, as can be seen from a study of the Knights of Malta, the luxurious life of peace soon led to corruption and immorality among them. A collection of amatory poems, in Greek, remains, addressed by these knights to the ladies of Rhodes, and by those fair dames to their monkish admirers.³ Chastity

¹ Cf. further *Monastic London*, an Analytical Sketch of the Monks and Monasteries, 1200 to 1600. By W. Stanhope. 5s. Also, *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*. Ed. by R. Howlett, Vol. iii. Longmans & Co., London.

² Schottmüller, *Der Untergang des Templer-Ordens*. 2 Vols. Berlin. Mittler & Sohn, 1887. M. 22.50.

³ *Rhodes in Modern Times* (from 3d century to Turkish occupation). By Carr. Cambridge.

was neglected and concubinage was common. Such a state of morals was also an inevitable concomitant of the celibacy of the clergy, which was finally firmly fastened upon the Roman Church by Gregory VII. Lawful wedlock being impossible, every grade of illicit intercourse crept in. A recent work shows how sunken morally were the English priests of the Middle Ages.¹ Bad men got into the minor orders of clergy to escape the civil courts; beyond that, however, they did not usually go. We read here of clergy charged with murder, robbery, burglary, adultery, and see the guilty ones degraded at the Church door. The clergy were guilty of many crimes, and ecclesiastical courts were too often very lenient to the guilty; but it must also be remembered that the clergy were still better than the average men of their times, and church judges were somewhat superior to the civil judges, who shared the jurisdiction with them. Monod illustrates these statements from an account of the times of Charlemagne, given by the Visigoth bishop Theodulf.² We hear at once that the civil judges were readily bribed. The gifts are named—cloth, veils, gloves, horses, jewels, Moorish gold money, Roman silver money, antique vases, Oriental stuffs, etc. Favorable decisions could easily be given, for the laws were very diverse, and judges very powerful. The Roman descendants had their own laws so had the Goths, also the Franks and the Spaniards, who were driven out of Spain by the Moors. What is told us

¹ *Memorials of the Church of SS. Peter and Wilfrid.* Ripon. Vols i and ii. Ed. by J. T. Fowler. London. B. Quaritch.

² Cf. *Les moeurs judiciaires au VIII Siècle*, in *Révue Historique* 1887. No. 1.

by Theodulf holds good essentially for the whole Empire, and shows widespread disorders. The judges passed their time largely in dissipation, came to court late, stayed but three hours a day on the bench, and scarcely one bailiff in a thousand employed by them was honest. Matters at court went on to suit the strong and the rich. In their interests laws against theft were particularly rigid. The punishment for stealing an ox was greater than for killing a man. For a first theft an eye was put out; for a second, the nose was cut off; for a third, the penalty was death. Murder was rarely punished with loss of life unless sacrilege were added to it.

V. MOVEMENTS LEADING TOWARDS THE REFORMATION.

The position of recent research into the pre-Reformation period has been well set forth by Karl Müller.¹ He finds that our views of that age, as reflected for example in the well-known book of Ullman, *Reformers before the Reformation*, have been changed and corrected by new information, especially in seeing that the fifteenth century was marked by a building up of ecclesiastical and religious life, in contrast with the breaking down, which had preceded it in the close of the fourteenth century. This revival went on in one direction till it reached the Reformation, which, consequently, did not appear in an age hostile to the Church and religion, but rather in a time of very great religious activity [*Erregung*], with which the Re-

¹ *Bericht über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Forschung auf dem Gebiet der vorreformatorischen Zeit*, in Vorträge der theolog. Konferenz zu Giessen, 1887.

formation must enter into competition. The Reform Councils sought to raise the Church by measures framed for the whole Catholic Church. Another kind of measures was introduced by Wiclif and Hus, who attempted reform rather along the line of a close connection of Church life with national life.

The view of Ullman, that there were Reformers before the Reformation, Müller says, is groundless, although so widespread; for, as Ritschl has pointed out,¹ these men and the movements which they caused, all stood on the ground of mediæval religion and thought. Of the fundamental principles and forces which mark specific evangelical piety there is no trace. Wiclif arose, as Buddensieg has shown,² when England was in transition. The oppressed Saxons were blending with their Norman lords, national prosperity was growing fast, but chiefly to make the nobles and the hierarchy richer by plundering the poor. The lower classes were led to look upon the poor as the godly; through the Minorites the idea was spreading of a terrible impending judgment of God upon the worldly Church; and the social war between capital and labor then took the garb of a struggle between the pious laboring man and the godless capitalist, whether noble or bishop. Such influences made Wiclif, and not any Reformation ideas, such as appear in the sixteenth century. It was especially the mediæval ascetic, above all the ideals of the Franciscans, through which the Church was then reformed. Another thought then made prominent was, that

¹ *Geschichte des Pietismus.* Bd. I, 1884; cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. iii, 1885, p. 183.

² *Wiclif und seine Zeit.* Halle, 1885. (Quoted by Müller.)

all mankind form a great complex life under God as supreme feudal lord, from whom every man receives in fee his worldly possessions; and these may rightly be lost by a breach of vassal obligations. This thought is thoroughly mediaeval. From it Wiclif argued that the hierarchy had broken their oath to God, and the State might well as instrument of divine judgment, deprive it of its wrongfully held possessions. The teaching also of Wiclif and Hus, that church membership depends on keeping God's law, and not on recognition of the hierarchy, and, that this law is in the Bible, not in the pope, does not leave mediaeval ground, for the Church as a means of grace with clergy and sacraments is still recognized and honored. The prominence given to God's law by Wiclif, shows that he was far from the position of the Reformers. The same is true of Hus. He presents but a new order of the elements of mediaeval thought and piety. Hus did not stand closely connected with the preachers of penitence, who preceded him. He began a new line, Wiclifism. This, combined with national Bohemianism, explains the whole Hus movement. Hus was a leader of both. The Bohemian national feeling took up Wiclifism, and they combined against what was German and ecclesiastical. The later Husite movement adopted much of the Franciscan and Joachim teachings, worked them over, and spread them widely in the second half of the fifteenth century, and thus prepared the way for both the religious fanaticism, the Anabaptist movement, as well as the social revolution of the sixteenth century. The same peculiarities appear in both the Husite and the Anabaptist movement. Out of both, too, after the time of ferment was past, are found arising sober, quiet

churches bearing the mediæval stamp, and showing the best products of mediaeval religiosity, viz., the Bohemian Brethren and the Mennonites.

Müller finds a second great group of reform efforts in the domain of monastic life. The movement here went hand in hand with the existing Church, and was more or less undertaken by it. The two prominent lines of activity here followed were, (1) the reforms in the Benedictine Order, and its related Orders, and (2) the work among the Beggar monks. The most important reforms among the Benedictines took place in Germany. New monasteries arose, and the old were brought into better discipline. But here, too, as we now know, all was mediaeval in thought. The Brothers of the Common Life, the author of the *Imitatio Christi*, were anything else but teachers of Reformation theology. Among the Beggar monks the reforms were more important. Three points are significant, according to Müller, (1) that these reformed congregations of monks had the greatest influence among the common people, they were the leaders of popular piety, in the second half of the fifteenth century; (2) in the special appearance of one of these congregations, that of the Augustine Eremites, to which Luther belonged; and, (3) in the commanding form of the reformed Dominican Savonarola. One striking fact about this reformed monasticism is, that nowhere in it is there a definite, original principle for the totality of Christian life; everywhere we find it broken up into a mass of observances, and a mystic fanaticism, especially for Mary and the saints, which sought to put spirit into the many observances of the Church. Müller says we now know that the writings of Augustine were

not zealously studied among the Augustines, neither did that Father's doctrines of grace reach Luther through this channel; we see here also how original and independent Luther was. Neither did Savonarola know or preach justification by faith; he remained a reformed Beggar monk, a preacher of penitence, a prophet of the coming judgment as described by Joachim.

Turning to the revival of religious life in general in Germany, Müller finds it proceed from the Low Countries, by way of Lower Saxony, through Central and South Germany. It showed itself chiefly in the better men, who entered the office of bishop and priest, and in the greatly improved and widespread religious literature. The whole time from about 1450 on, was a period of growing religious need, active religious effort, and an almost boundless increase of all the means of grace, which belonged to mediaeval piety,—church building, foundations of all sorts, architecture, painting, passion plays, processions, etc. There was also an unhealthy activity, which developed pilgrimages, witchcraft, saint worship, ghosts, an army of devils, and an army of angels and saints, all seen in conflict in the Church and in every human soul. There was thus heaped up a mass of inflammable material, which pointed towards a conflagration, that should destroy existing relations. Husite ideas went abroad, and we hear of men denying the doctrines of eternal punishment and indulgences. Revolutionary thoughts were in the air. Divine judgment would smite Church and clergy, noble and mighty; their riches would vanish, their property be given to the poor, the lazy priest should become a plowman, and the poor peas-

ant serve at the altar; so the ideas ran. It was a time when the social disparity had become more and more glaring, and rebellious hearts were demanding justice for the virtuous poor. These views were the natural outgrowth of mediæval ethics and social theories; they were applied by laymen to the rich and autocratic Church; they rested on the idea that all property claims were sinful, and all human authority associated with wrong. Hence reform in the direction of poverty was demanded. Through the fifty years preceding the Reformation, the prominent thoughts were, destruction of church riches, and the might of rulers. Complaints were loud that the Church was hopelessly corrupt. Socialistic and religious ideas were mingling, to bring a second Husite movement into play, this time throughout Germany. There was discontent of a mystical, communistic sort among the people, and a chaos of opinions threatened Europe. The only power that advanced was the civil government. The German rulers, through cries for reform, and through the consent of the pope, who saw rebellious clergy disregard his will, were enabled to increase their authority in both civil and religious affairs. This fact is of vast importance in view of the place which the princely power was to occupy in the sixteenth century. Müller sums up as follows: In most parts of Europe, in the fifteenth century, there was a stream of religious need, which, in Germany, spread over the nation like a flood. It met here with passionate outbursts of national discontent, which, in view of the breaking up of church relations, looked towards a terrible transition in the life of the people. Should the change be peaceful, or violent, a ref-

ormation, or a revolution? Both elements came into play, and find illustration later in the fanatics and Anabaptists, who appeared with Luther and Melanchthon, in the revolution of the knights and the Peasants' war, and in the growth of princely power and absolutism.¹ In Spain only did the mediæval ecclesiastical system receive complete establishment. Ferdinand and Isabella founded the Spanish kingdom; they also reformed the national Church, bringing the hierarchy under the Catholic kingdom; at the same time the laity were subjected rigorously to the hierarchy, in a way that fixed fast the old church religiosity in Spain. Then the Spanish king became ruler of Burgundy, Germany and Italy, and seeing his power threatened by the Reformation, in Germany, applied the principles of the Spanish church system unceasingly until the whole old Church was penetrated by them. Through reform of the Papacy, hierarchy and monasticism, through decisions in matters of doctrine, through the Jesuit Order, the Index and the Inquisition, these principles introduced the counter-Reformation, and brought about the new and terrible revival of the Papal Church. Everywhere in the fifteenth century there was a seeking after peace and rest, which the mediæval Church could not satisfy.

¹ Cf. Philippi, *Der Sogenannte Artikelbrief des Münsterschen Wiedertäufer Königs Johann von Leiden*, in *Ztfl. f. k. Geschichte*, 1888. Bd. I. H. 1, and, in general, Armitage, *A History of the Baptists*, London. 1887.

CHAPTER III.

THE MODERN CHURCH.

I. THE REFORMATION.

The new attitude assumed by the infallible Papacy towards the Reformation has called forth not a little apologetic literature from Protestant writers in defence of that great emancipation movement. The *Eneyelica* of Leo XIII. [1881] called the Reformation a Revolution, using that word in its evil sense, and charging it with producing all the violent changes which have since troubled Christendom. This position is defended at great length by Hohoff.¹ He treats of (1) "the great German Revolution of the sixteenth century," (2) "the great English Revolution of the seventeenth century," (3) "the great French Revolution of the eighteenth century," and (4) "the Revolution in the nineteenth century," under which he puts Socialism, Anarchism, Nihilism, and all the evils of modern society. The work is interesting as an extreme product of the new Ultramontane method of writing history. How little real liberty Roman Catholic scholars now enjoy has been shown by Nippold, in his reference to the three conditions under which Kraus' Church History

¹ *Die Revolution seit dem 16. Jahrhundert im Lichte der neuesten Forschung.* Freiburg, i. B.

was allowed to appear in a second edition.¹ (1) The extant copies of the first edition were to be called in; (2) in the new edition the points noted by the Index Congregation were to be corrected or left out; (3) before the new edition was printed it must be sent to Rome for approval. So Leo XIII. defines the extent to which his followers may go in using the Vatican stores which he has opened to their hands. All deviations from the Roman Church are to be treated as the desolating Revolution scattering firebrands and death. But this theory is capable of a two-sided application, as Greeven has just shown.² He carries the war into Roman Catholic lands, and points to Spain and her colonies, France and Belgium, Poland and Ireland as the particular breeding places of revolutions; just as Italy was, so long as the Church-State existed. Roman Catholic countries are the scene of political and social overturnings constantly manufactured, and of the most bloody character. On the other hand, healthful revolutions, like that in England, in 1688, and in France, in 1788, were crises resulting in good. Louis XV said "*apres moi le deluge*," for he knew the wrongs that cried to the God of Noah in France. He thought that "an archbishop of France should at least believe there was a God"; the higher clergy were profane, and every man saw how corruption filled the heart of the Church and the aristocracy. In 1787, the French king declared liberty of conscience, and in the same year the United States

¹ *Infallibilismus u. Geschichtsforschung*, in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theologie*. 1888. H. 1.

² *Das Jahr 1887 ein Jubeljahr der Gewissensfreiheit*, in *Deutsch-Evan. Blätter*. 1888. H. 1.

congress forbade the introduction by law of a new religion or the interference with any religion. All this liberty was born of the right kind of Revolution. Similar reasoning applies to the condition of things in the times of Luther. Every honest man felt that something must be done to reform the Church in both head and members. A recent study of the reform efforts of Duke George of Saxony, a man who refused to leave the Papal Church, abundantly illustrates this statement.¹ He turned his attention especially to the improvement of the monasteries in his land. Things grew so bad that from Duke William [1446] on, the rulers, without permission from Rome, took this matter in hand. At first entreaties and promises were made to the monks; then, in 1483, the ducal brothers, Ernest and Albert, complained to the pope, and demanded reform of the monasteries. The bishops tried to do it, but effected little. George then took the matter into his own hands. He had been educated for the priesthood, his good mother saying in a letter to him "I hope one day you will be a good preacher." He first took steps to work through the bishops; he found that not satisfactory, and then had his representatives work with those of the bishops. In 1504, we hear the bishop of Merseburg commanding his clergy to give up their wives and concubines, not to lie around in beer houses, not to receive strolling monks, excommunicated or irregular, "or even, horrible to tell, murderers." Nuns, too, are reported as wandering about outside of their cloisters.

¹ *Die Klostervisitation des Herzog Georg von Sachsen.* Von Gess. Leipzig, 1888. Cf. Also Hasse, *Geschichte der Sächsischen Klöster.* Gotha, 1888.

When the Reformation began under Luther, all the restless characters connected with monasteries seized the opportunity to escape. The evils which George set himself to oppose seemed multiplied, with Luther a lawless monk at the head of the disorders. He always spoke of the Reformer as "the perjured monk." He found him destroying the monasteries instead of reforming them. But the tide was too strong even for George. He saved the Augustinian monasteries of his land, while all around they disappeared. The storm of 1525, raised by the Anabaptists, however, destroyed many of them. The duke labored to restore them, but they never regained their former strength. Thus the Saxon ruler saw his reform efforts brought to naught by fanatics and extremists, who made the peace of ruin in the name of reform. And yet this staunch Roman Catholic held on, demanding a General Council for the reform of the Church. He said, "If the Roman Church saw herself short 10,000 guldens, there would come Anathema, an army on the march, all Christendom summoned to help; but now when it is only the salvation of the souls of hundreds of thousands, the good shepherd joins himself to him, who always broke in like the wolf on the fold," that is the king of France. No help came from Rome, so George went on with the work of monastic reform himself from 1535 to 1538. A visitation showed a sad state of affairs. With two exceptions, the cloisters were places of disorder, greed, "gluttony and drunkenness." Such a visitation was an unheard of thing in monastic experience, and the duke met with all sorts of hindrance in his work. Before he could finish his task he died, and under his successor

the monasteries fell : yet the labors of George deserve to be recalled to show how irreformable the Papal system as such is. He died clinging to the hope that a General Council might find a way of safety and improvement for the hard beset Church. But the popes would not call such a council, hence more and more must the Imperial Diets legislate in ecclesiastical matters. At the Diet of Worms, the cause of Luther became national. His famous words, which expressed his deep consciousness, that he stood for God and Fatherland, have just been found in a printed text of 1521, which appeared under Luther's own eyes, and settles the question. They run : *Ich kan nicht andrerst, hic steh' ich, Got helf' mir. Amen.*¹

After the early reformation conflict, a lull appeared at the Diet of Spires 1526. Here, as three times before, the effort was made to solve the religious question at a Diet ; but when this could not be effected, the attempt to reach a general deliverance was abandoned, and it was left to the several states to act, till a General Council should meet, as they should answer to God and the emperor. The Protestants accordingly regarded this as permission to go on with the Reformation. Such, at all events, is the commonly accepted view. Friedenburg, however, advocates² a theory very like that of the Roman Catholics, and holds that the Empire by no means gave up the attempt to solve the religious question, but rather made an energetic effort to settle it by saving church unity. Hence the embassy

¹ Cf. Dummer, *Lutherdrucke auf der Hamburger Stadtbibliothek, 1516-1523.* Leipzig, 1888.

² *Der Reichstag zu Speier 1526.* Berlin : R. Gärtner, 1887.

was sent to Charles V. to explain the matter, and to urge him to call a council, and visit Germany himself. Egelhaaf, on the other hand, maintains¹ that the Diet had no such intention or significance. Slowly the new leaven must work, away from a Christianity of legality and priestcraft, which a German Diet might grasp, towards that free Gospel, which can be really expressed only in a renewed life. Reforming Germany must pass through an experience like that of Luther himself, and that was a change spiritual and moral. He was the great founder of Protestant morals,² in breaking away from mediæval mysticism, and teaching that true work in any earthly calling, howsoever simple and lowly, is the work with which God is well pleased. In comparison with this all the highly praised works of asceticism and monasticism are utterly worthless. Here all discord between religion and morality at last ended. Luther avoided the extreme of unevangelical practices of the law, on the one hand, as he did extravagant antinomianism, on the other. For the conscience and heart he would have freedom from law; but for the outer life in the world and society, where the religious and godless are always together, the law should remain as controlling authority. How he applied these is seen in his classic work *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*. In reference to the wellknown controversy between Luther and Zwingli, Richard says,³ that had Calvin

¹ *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1888. H. 1, p. 113.

² So Pfeiderer, *Luther as Founder of Protestant Morals*, in *The Lutheran Quarterly*, Jan. 1888.

³ *Historical Development of the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, in *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1888.

instead of Zwingli been at the Marburg conference, Luther would have taken his offered hand; "as between his own view of the Lord's Supper and Calvin's, he did not see difference sufficient for controversy." It was Zwingli's rationalism that offended Luther; he thought Zwingli overthrew the sacraments as means of grace. Richard thinks that during the whole period of controversy the Lutheran Church has preserved her doctrine of the Lord's Supper "free from all gross, carnal, physical, local corruptions."

The Reformation in Hungary is ever associated with the persecution which the Gospel had to suffer here from the iron hand of Austria. A recent article illustrates this afresh from the sufferings of Hungarian Protestants, in the middle of the seventeenth century.¹ In one town of 6000 people all the men were summoned at once to trial for heresy. Thirty-nine citizens and four hundred of the common people in Pressburg were declared guilty in life and goods. Three hundred Protestant churches were confiscated in a few months. In 1674, all Protestant clergy and teachers in Hungary, with some students and church officers, were summoned to account. Forty-one faithful preachers were sent "like a herd of cattle" to Venice, where the survivors were sold as galley slaves at fifty scudi apiece. Thus did Austria and the Jesuits work their terrible plan of a counter-Reformation in Hungary. We are not surprised to learn that within four years 60,000 "heretics" were "converted," while a wave of Protestant emigration flowed over Switzerland, Holland and Germany.

¹ *Der grosse Kurfürst u. die protestantischen Ungarn*, in *Hist. Ztft.* 1887. H. 3.

The Reformation in Spain was so thoroughly crushed out that church historians pass it by with little or no mention. Recent research, however, is shedding not a little light upon this obscure page in the story of the persecuted Church.¹ Here, too, we find the same formalism and moral deadness, as prevailed elsewhere in Europe, in the fifteenth century. Cardinal Ximines, when he consecrated the great mosque of Albeyein to be a church, baptized 4000 Moors, who knew nothing about Christ, and did not wish to know anything about Him. Wilkens says: "The fifteenth century has been praised, as a period great in all directions, by spiritually blind and half blind humanists, philologists, and historians, on account of its discoveries and inventions, because, deceived by a Fata morgana of the Paradise Restored of ancient classic glory, they have overlooked the field full of dead men's bones." Ximines labored for reform in the Church, supported by queen Isabella and the Inquisition. He took away wealth from idle monks, Franciscans and others, and gave it to the poor pastors, schools, and hospitals. He purged both monks and priests. His aim was to strip off all that deformed the solemn structure of mediaeval Catholicism; but every other change was to be avoided. The traditional errors were to be kept; only their evil fruits were to be plucked off. In the sixteenth century, the mistake was widespread that the whole Church of the early centuries had a clear understanding of the Biblical way of salvation, but that it was lost, until restored by Luther. We now see, however, that cultus, decisions of councils, and Fathers

¹ Cf. Wilkens, *Geschichte des Spanischen Protestantismus im 16. Jahr.* Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann. 1888. M. 4.

did not set forth the teachings which God called Luther to present, in this our time, for all the Church. Justification by faith alone made sad breaks in the mediaeval system, and must overthrow it. This was soon felt in Spain, where the mediaeval theology was still in full vigor, and where Spanish pride and orthodoxy went hand in hand. All that was needed was to present what Luther taught, and the hate of Jew and Moor was ready for the Protestant. This hate was intensified by the fact that Charles V., a Spanish king, was emperor, and his power was hampered by German heretics. The king, and not a few others, saw in the sins of the clergy the excuse for heresy. Similar reasons account for the spread of the thin morality and thinner theology of Erasmus, in Spain. His followers formed both a churchly and a rationalistic school in the Church. The natural result was, also, an opposition to such teachings, and that not only among ignorant monks, but also among educated, godly men, who found no real spirituality in Erasmus. Alfonso de Valdes, secretary of state, was an Erasmian, but his defence of the sack of Rome by the emperor, speaking of it as God's judgment upon the corruptions of that city, with its Renaissance vileness, worked against Erasmian teachings in Spain, for the sack of Rome was indefensible. The pope condemned all the works of Erasmus, except his writings against Luther, and the Spanish Inquisition set itself to stamp out Erasmians.

As for the Lutheran heresy, every effort was made to keep it out of Spain. Yet Spanish students at French universities heard of the new doctrines. Juan Diaz was such an one, a Spanish theologian, who became a Lutheran,

a friend of Calvin, and defended Protestantism before Spanish courtiers at Regensburg. He was assassinated by his own brother, and fell the first Protestant martyr of Spain. Francisco de Enzinas translated the New Testament into Spanish ; but it was not allowed to be published in Spain. Juan de Valdes, twin brother of the secretary, became an earnest Protestant, and led his noble friends, humanitarians, especially in Naples, towards the Gospel. He influenced the noble Reginald Pole, later cardinal. Ochino took texts from him. He taught Peter Martyr to read Paul's Epistles, and many Italian ladies of princely rank were influenced by him. But the movement soon came to an untimely end, for the papal Church stamped out these students of St. Paul, and, like Saul of Tarsus, thought it was doing God service. In Spain, secret believers read Luther's Commentary on the Galatians, also a catechism by Carranza, an evangelical archbishop of Toledo, while other Spanish Protestant books came from Italy to help on the quiet propaganda. Fuente exercised great influence in Seville by his preaching and writings.¹ These evangelical works escaped the notice of the Inquisition under cover of mysticism, because they referred to Bernard and Bonaventura, and had points of contact with later mystics, who wished not only to know of Christ, but to possess him ; so this similarity of aim in mystics and

¹ Translations of these, and other works, have been made by J. T. Betts, 1869, 1882, 1883, London. Cf., in general, the series *Reformistas antiguos Espanoles*, 1863 ff., Menendez y Pelayo, *Historia de los Heterodoxos Espanoles*, 1880 ; and the classic work, *Bibliotheca Wiffeniana*. Spanish Reformers of two centuries from 1520. By E. Boehmer. 1874-1883. 2 Vols. For the literature since 1848, see Wilkens, in *Ztft. f. K. Geschichte*, 1887. H. 2.

evangelicals covered, in the eyes of most, the divergency of the ways proposed to reach it.

One of the writings of Penafuerte, based on a sermon of Ochino's, showed the sad decline of the Papacy, and led the Inquisition to proceed against the secret Lutherans in Seville, who numbered three hundred. De Reina fled to London, where he drew up a Protestant confession for the Spanish exiles there. Then he labored in Basle, where he spent nine years on his Spanish Bible, which has become the classic translation of the Scriptures. It was in Valladolid, however, that the persecution first broke out. Ca-zalla led the martyr band of fifteen at the first *auto da fé*. Many others suffered less severe punishment. Fuente was often summoned before the Holy Office; as he said "they want to burn me, but find me too green yet." He died later in prison. Four *auto da fés* ended the Protestant movement in Valladolid and Seville. Thousands were not put to death, as is usually stated. It did not need such slaughter, for "the misunderstood and hated Spanish Protestantism was a morning dawn with no succeeding day." The old system remained unshaken, and we are not surprised a little later to hear of so many corrupt priests that twenty scribes could not take down the complaints made, after notice requesting such complaints to be made, though they spent thirty days at it. For ninety days veiled women in Seville told their sad tales of priestly immorality.

Turning to England, in Reformation days, we see from a recent life of Wolsey¹ how Christendom was then still

¹ Creighton, *Twelve English Statesmen, Cardinal Wolsey*, London, Macmillan & Co. 1888.

regarded as one united body, and how naturally England tried to be a mediator between contending states, as a member of the great system. Wolsey sought to make her "secure a leading position in European affairs, which since his days has seemed her natural right." The prime minister in the time of Henry VIII. was first of all the servant of his sovereign. The principle of authority was so strong that a statesman felt his first duty was to obey his king, as the churchman felt his first duty was to obey the Church. This idea of unquestioning obedience may help explain the persecutions of both Catholics and Protestants in England, now done at the command of the king, now under the feeling of loyalty to the pope. How these things appear to a Jesuit historian can be seen in the work of Spillman.¹ During the whole period of Protestant supremacy in Britain 353 persons are claimed by the Roman Catholic Church to have died as martyrs. But that is just about as many as the number of Protestants, that fell in the one short reign of Mary. Among the fifty-four martyrs pronounced "blessed" by Leo XIII [1886] occur eighteen Carthusian monks; and the account of their monastery shows primitive simplicity, devotion and purity; the king and his visitors were criminals compared with not a few of the monks whom they plundered. These martyrs fell opposing the act of supremacy by which Henry VIII made himself pope. This monarch might well bewail the religious demoralization, which he saw in England, in his last days. Under Elizabeth, we are told, twenty-six Catholics were put to death, up to 1583; the greater

¹ *Die Englischen Martyrer unter Heinrich VIII und Elisabeth.*
2 vols. Freiburg, i. B. Herder, 1887.

number fell later. Sixteen of these were priests, who had been trained in the English Seminaries of Douay, Rheims and Rome. These young priests saved the Catholic Church in England from the fate that befell it in Denmark and Scandinavia. Henry retained Catholicism but rejected the pope. Elizabeth followed the policy of Edward, and allowed Protestantism to spread. The Catholic peasantry rebelled but, Spillman says, were crushed [1549] through the help of German troops and Italian sharpshooters. Calvin, he adds, urged Somerset to slay the followers of the Roman Antichrist with the sword. Then Mary came to the throne, and not till her gentleness was abused did she take sterner measures.¹ "In fact," we are told, "most of those put to death were notorious rebels and common criminals, who had more than once deserved the death penalty." Spillman admits, however, that the number of executions, 288, was sadly large. As an offset, he says that Elizabeth, crushing a rebellion, killed three times as many. She perjured herself, he continues, when she came to the throne by swearing to defend the Catholic religion, and then goaded the Catholics into rebellion. Cecil knew a rebellion was being planned, but preferred to let it break out and then punish it. During the war with France Elizabeth declared to the papal Nuntius that she was a true Catholic.

¹ For much light on the relations in the reign of Mary, See *Reginald Pole, Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury. A Biography.* By Lee. London. Nimmo. 1888.

II. THE HUGUENOTS.

Baird is not certain how many Huguenots left France, whether 800,000 or 300,000, and continues, "much the greater part of the Protestants found themselves compelled to renounce all thought of escape."¹ They must stay in France. Of the ministers, however, very few were bribed to stay and submit: "all the others, between six and seven hundred in number," not 2000, as is sometimes said, "left the realm rather than renounce their faith." To stay after 1686 was certain death. In this last decade of the seventeenth century, French Protestants were left as sheep without a shepherd, and Bible reading, especially of the prophets, became the comfort of these oppressed ones. Now arose "prophets," claiming direct revelations from Heaven against Rome as Antichrist, much as they arose in the thirteenth century among the Franciscans. Their preaching gave rise to the war of the Camisards, which raged from 1702 to 1704. It was civil war to the death. After this, in 1715, arose the Church of the Desert, taking some form of organic life. Antoine Court became now the restorer of French Protestantism, "the eldest son of Calvin," as he was called, the boy preacher in the wilderness. The first prominent synod was organized in 1715. Baird refers to Hugues' edition of the Acts of these Synods as of great value. It appeared in three volumes, 1885 to 1887, and covers the period from 1715 to the last synod, in 1796. From this work we see that the Church in France, in the Desert, "was devoted to the idea of a

¹ Cf. *The French Synods of the Desert*, in *The Presbyterian Review*, Jan. 1888.

well-ordered government." Proper rules of debate were prominent from the outset. Great care was taken as soon as possible to "secure a ministry pious, exemplary in conduct, able and learned." For this purpose, at the wise suggestion of Court, a theological seminary was planted across the border on the friendly soil of Switzerland.

The expatriated Huguenots, as well as the Protestant refugees from Hungary, found one of their best friends in Frederick, the great Elector of Prussia. As early as the time of Luther and Calvin Huguenots had settled in different parts of Germany.¹ A system of colonization appeared first in the Rhine Palatinate, the first colony being in Mannheim. The Lutherans in Saxony tried to keep these Reformed Christians out of their land, and about 20,000 of the 600,000, according to Tollin, who left France, went to Prussia. There were in Berlin, in 1703, 5689 Huguenots, with twelve pastors, out of a population of 37,000; now there are but 5000, with six ministers, in a population of 1,500,000. But who can tell the strength and blessing this Huguenot blood and spirit may have poured into the national life of Prussia? What gain, even temporal, these French Protestants brought to Germany may be learned from the statement that they introduced sixty-five trades and industries unknown before in Prussia.

¹ See Tollin, *Geschichte der französischen Kolonie in Magdeburg*, 1 Bd. Halle : Niemeyer. 1886.

III. CHURCH LIFE IN HOLLAND.

Of the secession movement going on in Holland in behalf of orthodoxy,¹ we have just received two different accounts. Cairns says² all authorities agree, that the return of Holland to a supernatural Christianity, during the last twenty years, has been decided. This return assumes two aspects, a more liberal and a more confessional. Of the one the late Dr. Van Oosterzee was a prominent representative; of the other the leader is Dr. Kuyper. This latter school has, since 1885, brought on a crisis. The eleven churches in Amsterdam are under one church council of 140 members, a majority of whom were orthodox in 1885, and were suspended, in 1886, by the synod, for refusing to accept to membership persons who did not profess Jesus Christ as their only Saviour. Cairns holds, against the rationalistic synod, that Kuyper's contention, that he and his followers were suspended on doctrinal grounds, is correct. The suspended ministers hired six large halls in Amsterdam, which were filled at their services, while those held in the churches were almost forsaken. Kuyper claims that two-thirds of the church-going people in the capital sympathize with the Reform party. The theological position of the orthodox, in opposition to the synod, was sharply summed up by Kuyper in his *Last Word*, addressed to that body in 1886. He says: "You do not share our convictions. As a synod you do *not* confess the three-one God; you do *not* find

¹ Cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. v, 1888, p. 218.

² *Struggle in the Church of Holland*, in *The Presbyterian Review*, Jan. 1888.

yourselves in sympathy with our sense of guilt in the presence of the Holy One; you do *not* believe in eternal punishment; you do *not* glory in Immanuel as God over all blessed forever, you are not at home in the holy mysteries of his miraculous birth, sin-aton ing death, justifying resurrection, and glorious ascension in our human flesh." Again, "the Church of Christ is *not* to you a company of believers with their seed; Holy Scripture is *not* the sole authority by which all human opinion is to be judged; the Headship of Christ is *not* to you an official sovereignty, but a figure for the influence of his past appearance in History." Yet the synod deposed these men on a question of outward order, a synod "to whom all inward harmony had long been indifferent." In May, 1887, this Reform movement had fifty ministers in its service and had raised about \$50,000. We turn now to another account¹ of this Secession under Kuyper, written from Holland anonymously, but evidently by some one not in sympathy with the party of orthodoxy. He admits that the movement began against the boundless license allowed preachers in doctrinal matters; it then proceeded to fight for a free church system; and this involved much bitterness of feeling. He says the spirit of the days of Dort is abroad, and "godless synods" charge "synodal blood-hounds" with terrible things in judgment. The cry of the "reformers" is, "back to the old church order which we had before 1816." They are accused of using unscrupulous means to gain their ends. It is said that Kuyper's influence is weakening, and his attacks becoming more

¹ *Das Ende der "reformirten" Bewegung in der niederländischen reformirten Kirche*, in *Deutsch-Evangelische Blätter*, 1888. H. 4.

personal. The supporters of the free university, in Amsterdam, we are told, have diminished by 300, and the contributions have fallen off sixty-five per cent in Rotterdam. And yet we hear that the preachers in Amsterdam receive already \$300 more salary than at first, while those in Rotterdam get \$425 additional. In 1886, the "reformers" took possession of one of the churches in Amsterdam, and guarded it day and night with twenty men. They were also charged with plotting to seize all the churches of the city. In one case, we are told, it came to blows, and street fights with bloodshed. After the expulsion of seventy-five ministers and elders, in December, 1886, an independent church was formed in Amsterdam, and the authority of the "Synodal hierarchy" thrown off. The old name was chosen, "The Low German Reformed Church." They called themselves also "the dolirend Church," or "the grieving Church," a name used in the seventeenth century by the orthodox, who suffered under State oppression. Church buildings and other property were given up to the state Church. In January, 1887, the "Reformed Congress" met in Amsterdam, attended by 2000 persons, who all declared it their belief, that the yoke of the Synod should be shaken off. The Church authorities soon after declared such persons no longer in the Church: and then arose a number of free churches. The Reformers claim to be the true Church of Holland, they have over 20,000 members in Amsterdam, about one-eighth of the total membership: besides the churches here and in Rotterdam, there are also 10,000 members in other places. At the conference in Rotterdam, in June, 1887, there were represented eighty free churches and forty

churches still “under the yoke;” that is, about one tenth of the 1345 Reformed congregations in Holland have joined the Free Church movement. At this conference, in Rotterdam, the Presbyterian organization of the old Church was renewed, with modifications. To meet the needs of the people, students from any institution might be examined for the ministry, nay even those who had received no academic training, but were men of gifts, could be received into the ministry. This is in harmony, he says, with the whole movement as “Independency of the pious people.” In some cases the Reformers got possession of the churches, in others they built their own; otherwise they met in barns, or, more frequently, in school houses. Opponents of Kuyper call him a pope, and hold that the movement is betraying the Church into the hands of the Papacy. The outcome of this struggle for a Free Church in Holland will be watched with great interest.¹

IV. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The drift in the Roman Catholic Church in our days seems towards higher ecclesiastical claims, especially in the case of the pope himself, and a lower degree of intelligent piety and zeal. The fierce light of modern investigation does not allow a prominent theologian to be made a saint as readily as did the “dim religious light” of pre-Reformation times. The full account of the attempts made to canonize Bellarmine, now published for the first time,²

¹ Cf., further, Geesink, *Calvinisten in Holland*, Rotterdam, 1887.

² *Die Selbstbiographie des Cardinals Bellarmin.* mit geschichtl. Erläuterungen von Döllinger und Reusch. Bonn, 1887.

illustrates this tendency. Such efforts began in 1627, they were resumed in 1827, and are still going on. The Congregation of Rites decided that the learned Jesuit be made a saint, but the popes ever hesitated ; his Autobiography, especially, told too much honest truth about the man, who defended Pelagianism and asked for reforms in the Church, to make it expedient to canonize him. It is difficult for any man who is very prominent in the Church to have his private life revealed, and be regarded as possessing the theological and cardinal virtues in the heroic degree required of saints. Augustine is the only great ecclesiastic who published his *Confessions* and yet was made a saint. Gregory I. who died in 604, was the last pope canonized. The life of Leo XIII, just published,¹ will doubtless form no exception to this experience, that for twelve hundred years the official bearers of the title "Holiness" have not been numbered among the highest official saints. And yet there is no reason why the spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice, in the Roman Catholic Church, should not become more and more manifest. Many earnest efforts in other days for good were thwarted by the close, the material connection between the Church and the estates of this world. During our century, as never before since the time of Constantine, has the current of events turned the Papacy away from temporal power, and pointed the whole Church towards the saying, "My kingdom is not of this world."

How this movement went on in Germany is well described by Brück, in his *History of the Catholic Church in*

¹ *Life of Leo XIII.* From an authentic memoir furnished by his order. By B. O'Reilly. L. Webster & Co., 1887.

the Nineteenth Century, the first volume of which we have and which treats only of the Church in the Fatherland, from the beginning of the century to the Concordat discussions. The author well terms it, especially from the Roman Catholic point of view, "one of the saddest periods of the Church History of Germany," for in this time, as he shows with great wealth of detail, the Romish Church here was deprived of its position as a great temporal power. There were, until this century, three ecclesiastical Electors among the princes, those of Cologne, Treves, and Mayence, besides twenty-three archbishops and bishops, who were also temporal lords with landed estates and seats in parliament. These princely bishops had also large revenues from their ecclesiastical positions, so we are not surprised to learn that the Catholic Church of Germany, at the end of the eighteenth century, could lose 35,460 square miles of territory, 3,161,776 subjects, and over eight million dollars of annual income, not to speak of the many monasteries that were confiscated. Brück seems to make it plain, that the ecclesiastical states of Germany were better governed than the purely civil powers. The saying, "The best life is under the crozier," appeared in this case to be true. It is interesting to trace the influence of French scepticism, from 1750 on, upon German Catholics, and to see how native rationalism spread in the Romish Church. The activity of Von Hontheim, bishop of Treves, who under the name of Justin Febronius, attacked the Papacy in the interests of more liberty, is depicted. He held that the pope should not be lord over the Church, the liturgy should be simple, superstitions, pilgrimages, etc., should be avoided, and the walls

between Catholics and Protestants be broken down. It was the “Illumination” spirit in the Romish Church. The prince-prelates of Mayence, Cologne and Treves supported this antipapal movement; so did the archbishop of Salzburg; and, in 1786, the Ems Punctuation was signed by these leaders, by which the authority of the pope was declared to be only that of a primacy of honor. But such a movement, we are assured, rested upon rationalistic and revolutionary, rather than upon spiritual convictions, and soon came to naught. The same was true of the Kantian theology, which spread in the German Catholic Church for a time, especially at the universities of Mayence, Treves and Bonn. Better influences seem to have moved the archbishop of Salzburg, who issued a pastoral letter, in 1782, the twelve hundredth jubilee of his diocese, recommending simplicity in worship and true preaching of God and the Bible, both in church and at home; reading of the Scriptures was urged upon the clergy; rural deans were instructed to see that every priest had a German Bible and commentary, and that he studied them daily; German hymns were to be sung in church and explained by the clergy; then, the directions ran off into “Illumination”; the clergy should teach “enlightenment and morality,” “philosophical doctrines of ethics,” “theory of health, especially of dietetics,” etc. Next came the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, which so humbled Germany. The conqueror annexed all lands west of the Rhine, and, to compensate the German princes for this loss, they were given the territory of the ecclesiastical princes. Such secularization of Church property began with Frederick the Great. In a letter to Voltaire in 1767, he spoke

of his plan to destroy "the Infamy," that is Christianity, by putting an end to the monasteries, those "asylums of fanaticism"; then the people, he said, would soon become indifferent to religion. So France and her German allies proceeded along the line of secularization marked out for them by the great Frederick. Napoleon wished to weaken the Empire, so he made separate treaties with the German States, rewarding each with lands taken from the Church. A pitiful business of bribery went on at the French court, German princes getting ecclesiastical estates. Napoleon strengthened Prussia to overthrow Austria, and with it the Empire; and that strengthened Prussia was afterwards to put an end to Napoleonic rule and restore the German Empire. Brück points out fairly the autoeratic encroachments of the civil rulers in Germany, both Protestant and Catholic, upon the rights of the Church, and their inability to grasp the idea of the spiritual liberty of a Church. In this respect the Catholic Church in Germany has fought the battle of true religious independence. The Prussian idea, that "the king is the source of all rights, also religious, Catholic as well as Protestant," cannot be recognized by any Christian who believes in the divine origin of the Church and the "duality of supreme authority," which flows from such a conception. The Church is more than a department of state. In 1810, the prince-primate of Germany, president of the Rhine league, Dalberg was given for successor Eugene Beauharnais, Napoleon's step son, and so the last spiritual prince of Germany went down in the general secularization of the lands of the Church.

V. RECENT THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSIONS IN GERMANY.

A most suggestive introduction to the theology of Germany at present is the correspondence of Martensen and Dorner,¹ which reflects in a very interesting way the chief ecclesiastical and doctrinal movements of Europe, during the past fifty years. Such a work cannot be summarized; we can but select here and there some fragment of wisdom from it. Martensen says, "The position, that whoever has the witness of the Spirit within him, has the right to construct his theology out of his now renewed spirit, yea, even to subject the doctrine of the Church and the doctrine of the Scriptures to criticism, is certainly right; only the theological categories, by which the criticism is guided, must be really those of the Christian spirit." Dorner replying, speaks of the relation of Ethics to Dogmatics, and admits that he finds it very hard to keep them apart. "They have in common the doctrines of sin, regeneration, sanctification, and the Church." The principles of Ethics proper, he finds to be "the world of will;" theologically it is Christ, for he is (1) personal law and personal virtue, (2) he is through the Holy Spirit, the essential principle of Christ, virtue, and (3) he is, as head of the Church, founder of the community of God, and essential principle of the highest good, the kingdom of God. Martensen agrees with this, and says "the great thing in the Kant-Fichte view was, that it regarded the whole world as a work [*Aufgabe*] of free personality." Dorner repeats, that Ethics and Theology must be kept in unity, and thinks that the flight from Rationalism shows

¹ *Briefwechsel zwischen Martensen u. Dorner.* 1888. 2 Vols.

itself in this^{*} identification much more than in going beyond such identification. Martensen rejoices to find that Dorner agrees with him that in the "objective moral forms of life," "the family and the Church form the two end points of the organism of morality." The German friend then asks how the Son of Man could pray. The Danish friend replies, that he always associated Christ's praying with his temptation ; if the latter was a reality for him, then he had a real need to pray. Through prayer and conflict he overcame temptation, and so actualized his divine-human being, and made his empirical activity a sufficient manifestation of his essential glory. In November, 1841, we find the Strauss controversy referred to in the correspondence. Martensen thinks that Strauss constantly confounds the letter and the spirit of Christian facts, just what the Bible says such men do. Dorner says in such questions we must hold fast to the relative independence of religion, of Christianity, in contrast to all the knowledge of science. We must, further, lay stress upon the ethical idea in opposition to materialistic or pantheistic abstractions. Here he finds the influence of Schleiermacher, who blends Ethics and Dogmatics, so powerful. In Renan's *Life of Jesus*, Dorner sees an attempt to present the historic Jesus ; but inasmuch as the critic thinks that Jesus presented himself as the Son of God, he runs inevitably towards the decisive dilemma : Jesus was either the Son of God, or the most base and godless blasphemer. He adds, "The clearer and sharper science sets forth this dilemma, the nearer comes the decision between belief and unbelief." We soon after hear the friends talking of love and literature across the field of battle between Denmark

and Prussia. Martensen laments the spirit of Revolution that was growing up in Europe, and saw in the negative theology of Schenkel and others part of the movement which flattered fleshly ideas of liberty. Dorner remarks that it is noticeable that the great Church historians, Gieseler, Baur, Neander, left so insignificant a school behind them. But, he continues, the controversy now is not in Church History but in the Life of Christ. Renan says Jesus was an enthusiast of gigantic mould, who thought Himself Son of God in the ontological sense; He then became a personal idyll, a dramatic hero, finally, a tragic sacrifice. Strauss thinks He was the unity of the Semitic and Greek spirit, who transfigured monotheism into gentleness and beautiful humanity by his blessed, unbroken nature. Schenkel considers Him the pure man, whose doctrine was pure morality and worship of God in spirit and truth, whose work was the deliverance of the people from their spiritual leaders. Dorner adds, that all these views ignore what the New Testament makes most prominent, that Jesus came to redeem the world and reconcile it to God. "His enemy was sin, not the Romans, not the Hierarchs." And for this work He claimed the miracle of sinlessness; so here again the dilemma is: either Son of God, or a blasphemous degree of vanity and self-deception. Respecting church unity, Dorner thinks it must be ethical, not theological. Perhaps on the basis of the predicates One, Holy, Catholic, the Church Universal could meet. The Church should not consist solely of regenerate persons, for it is also, he adds, a *seminarium fidei*. But, negatively, he continues, holiness must be applied to keep out of church offices unworthy men. He

finds Puseyism at work in Hengstenberg and the High Church leaders in Prussia. He laments also the spirit of the young theologians growing up about him [1864]. He finds in them so frequently a lack of "the poetic and speculative sense, if not also the religious;" they take an empirical and critical position. Martensen says that as a Lutheran, he found the Danish Church based solely upon the *Augustana* and the Small Catechism; but Luthardt and Thomasius put the German Church upon the whole symbolical *Corpus*, especially the *Formula Concordie*; this made the latter so unyielding towards the Union Church of Prussia. In 1871, Dorner notices Ritschl's work on the Atonement, and says: "He seems to me—at present his point of view is not very clear—at the outset to promise something; yet although I recognize keenness and much that is excellent in the historical criticism, yet I doubt whether he will positively further the doctrine. I have so far noticed no speculative vein in him; against mysticism he seems to have a sort of aversion." "He seems to have turned aside as far as possible, from questions of principle, but exalts the Church in opposition to personal assurance of salvation." Later, he says that Ritschl sees no real progress in history; he sees all pass bye, intentionally or necessarily, without any principle being noticed. "He has an instinctive hatred of mysticism and pietism, that is not based upon scientific principles, and in an irresponsible way weakens the doctrine of justification. He has so little conception of the importance of this truth, that he goes on, as if the Church had had justification before the Reformation and its theology." In the Old Testament, Dorner finds him explain-

ing away violently all that points toward expiation and the justice of God. He does not regard guilt as a punishable state, only sin is that; the connection between sin and outer evil appears to him as made through subjective consciousness, not through the objective divine attribute of justice. Dorner recurs again to his favorite theme, and says, "I come more and more to the conviction that the deepest need in our Lutheran Church system hitherto, has been that the ethical side of Christianity was too little recognized." "Justification has been made to cover all sins, even those of the future in advance, and that becomes but another form of Indulgence." In Martensen's book on Ethics, he finds a most valuable work for reconciling culture and Christianity. He touches the question, whether morality is possible without religion and Christianity. Martensen distinguished between humane, and religious-Christian morality, and showed that Rothe's idea, of having a Christian morality without a Christian faith was untenable. Dorner adds, "I wish the further proof were given, that the morality of mere Humanism must be inwardly different, and of a worse order, than that of the Christian character. If the virtue of Humanism is not to remain behind the ideal of Humanism itself, does not this very ideal, if it is to be realized without God, point to an inner contradiction?" Dorner says he likes to see the physical and logical attributes of God subordinated to the ethical conception of God; but thinks that the attribute of justice should not be brought too near that of love, otherwise it will be difficult to provide the organisms of State and Church with definite distinguishing principles. Referring to the heresy trial of Dr. Sydow [1873],

who taught Sabellianism and denied that Jesus was born of a virgin, Dorner says that a Unitarian secession from the Church was possible, but "all shrank back from the beginning of North American conditions." What most impressed him on his visit to America, in 1873, was the conviction forced upon him "that here Christianity had a popular character, that it was a people's matter, and had a national life. That we had by no means imagined."

In 1876, appeared Hermann's Essay on *Metaphysics in Theology*, attacking Dorner, and saying that a speculative theology is an impossibility. Dorner remarks, "It is depressing to see how all pluck for higher scientific studies is wanting among the young men." "They never get beyond what is empirical-psychological, or subjectivism." He sees theology constantly growing poorer. Of Lipsius' works on Dogmatics Martensen thinks unfavorably. "Christ as religious ideal, but with all that is historic, especially miracles, surrendered to negative criticism, also all that is metaphysical cut off; what remains after this subtraction but a cloud form, where we should hold on to 'the principle'?" His chief error, Martensen finds, is his ignoring in the conception of religion the knowledge *in* religion, which precedes theological knowledge, and is not only a knowledge of the relations of God to us, but also of the Being of God as mirrored to us in his revelation. He observes the same weakness in Hermann, who does not see that theology has its own proper metaphysics, developed from the Christian faith, which it frames for itself. He finds Hermann's Essay to be but an echo of Schleiermacher's statement, that Dogmatics must be entirely separated from philosophy. To reject all meta-

physics in religion is to reject the writings of John and Paul. With this criticism Dorner agrees, and thinks that the Subjectivism of this school opens the doors to all extravagances, by denying the objective knowability of truth. He says Hermann's book on Religion [1879] "lays a foundation for a know-nothing theology." Hermann Schultz he calls one of the Agnostics, who adorn themselves with knownothingism under the appearance of strictly scientific requirements. In 1879, Dorner writes that he was thinking much about "conditional immortality." The book of White, *Life in Christ*, which advocated this view, was approved by Gess and Hermann Schultz; Dorner now read it, but could not accept its teaching of the natural mortality of the soul. Martensen took the same position, and held that every human soul was made for communion with God. Can a conscience ever die? he asks. An ethical being cannot be merely physical and perish like the beasts.

Leaving the companionship of these two great ethical theologians,¹ we are brought again by the controversial theology of Germany to notice the school of Ritschl, which still attracts chief attention among students of divinity. A recent criticism of this system² seeks to show that Ritschl, by making the kingdom of God consist solely in the moral fellowship of men, thereby fatally separates religion and morals. Closely connected with this dualism he finds arising the conflict of religious dependence and moral freedom, which

¹ For an estimate of Dorner, see an article by D. W. Simon, in *The Presbyterian Review*, Oct., 1887.

² F. Luther, *Die Theologie Ritschl's.* A Lecture. Reval. 1887.

is to find its solution in Christianity ; and hence the proper theme of Christianity, victory in the struggle between the old man of sin and the new man of God, is postponed ; further, the Bible doctrines of freedom and the world are given a foreign meaning, God becomes a mere means, by which man either frees himself from God himself, if the world be regarded as equal to divine Providence, or does what God himself cannot do, that is if the world of nature be regarded as indifferent to our moral aims, and evil be derived from purely mechanical causes. This false dualism, Luther finds further overthrowing the Scripture contraries of Law and Gospel, wrath and righteousness of God on the one hand, and grace and love, on the other, the opposites of the reconciled child of God and the natural man. He says that the ignoring of these contraries in the theology of Ritschl practically sets aside the divinity of Christ, and the personal work of the Spirit, while the idea of justification is apprehended in a way that involves reasoning in a circle. He holds that a moral quantity is here set up beside God, in the presence of which God himself is lost. He maintains further that Ritschl's theology leads to a thoroughly Pelagian view of life, for what else can a doctrine of perfection be which does not rest on repentance and communion with Christ? The Ritschl doctrine of prayer, which teaches only thanksgiving, he shows to be at utter variance with the Scriptures. The God of this theology, he concludes, is "no God for men, certainly no God for sinful men ; he is only a God for deified men." Yet Luther finds a great number of single truths in Ritschl's teaching that are of great importance. Some of these are : The aim of justification

is the begetting of true morality ; faith in justification makes us free lords of all things ; the certainty of reconciliation through Christ must precede joyous faith in the paternal providence of God ; the idea of the kingdom of God is made prominent in contrast to all individualistic piety ; faith preserves its power, not in renouncing the world, but in a sound rule over the world ; the Christian life is a process of becoming divine ; the evangelical Christian life has its decisive mark, not in the quantity of works, but in the quality of its moral exercises in the free air in which it shows its love ; Christian perfection has its essential condition in the presentation of a unity of life-course ; joy is to form the fundamental tone of a life in justifying faith ; and, that in our knowledge of God we must begin, not from above, but from beneath, from the humanity of Christ. Zahn, a pastor, thinks¹ Ritschl is right in separating theology from philosophy ; but, in not basing his theology upon the experience of conversion, as Hofmann did, or, in not seeking to draw it from a direct analysis of sayings of the Scriptures, as Beck did, he fell into that weak rationalism, which tries to justify Christianity before ordinary reason, and rejects all that does not agree with such reason. Hermann Schmidt thinks² this criticism is just, and that, if the peculiar terminology of Ritschl's teaching be stripped off, the results will appear very much those of the old rationalism. This Kantian theology runs towards the deistic moralism inaugurated by Kant. Krüger attacks the supranaturalistic claims of the school

¹ *Bemerkungen zu Ritschl's theologischer Wissenschaftslehre.* A Lecture. Gotha. Schloßmann. 1887.

² *Theolog. Litteraturblatt*, 1888. No. 24.

of Ritschl,¹ and holds that the one-sided prominence given it is in conflict with the Bible, which recognizes the preparatory points, and points of connection in the natural man. As for the elimination of the doctrine of the acceptance of salvation, in Ritschl's system, he pronounces it in open contradiction to the teaching of the Scriptures and the common faith of the Church. He finds, too, a doublemeaningness, arising from the contradiction between the rationalistic limitations of the domain of revelation and the claim to found common Christian belief, which leaves us in doubt in respect to the most weighty matters, such as the resurrection, divinity of Christ, etc. Häring, on the other hand, shows the importance of Ritschl's view, which makes the love of God the principal cause of redemption, and wards off heathen error in the doctrine of expiation. He then seeks to supplement the master's teaching by adding the idea of Gess, that active obedience of positive performance should take the place of bearing punishment vicariously, in the atonement by Christ.

Lipsius is sometimes spoken of as also belonging to the school of Ritschl, but he, too, appears among the critics of the system.² He objects to the limitation of revelation to Christ and the Scriptures, as is done by Ritschl, while the protest against all knowledge of God from nature is shown to be very like the Socinian positivism, which landed in such fatal consequences. Häring, however, finds in this return to Christ a deliverance from a great mass of ar-

¹ *Phantasie oder Geist?* Bremen. Müller. 1887.

² *Die Ritschl'sche Theologie.* A Lecture. Leipzig. Reichert, 1888; also in *Jahrbb. f. prot. Theologie.* 1888, H. 1.

tificial theological forms, which are often painfully strange to the confessions and life of the Church. Yet, he adds, this revelation through Christ must not be so pressed as to undermine the Old Testament Scriptures. On Ritschl's limitation of all Christian knowledge to that found in the Scriptures, Lipsius says, that it leaves "no distinction of *articuli puri et mixti*, no interblending of Natural Theology, there is no Natural Theology, for by the means of theoretical knowledge of the universe we can reach no conclusions respecting God's nature and purposes." Of the position given the kingdom of God in Ritschl's theology,¹ Lipsius says there is nothing original about it, and adds that the thought of God's kingdom is independent of the Christian revelation. In reference to the Christology of Ritschl, Lipsius holds it differs in nothing essential from that of the modern theology; and he has no right to speak of the Godhead of Christ. He is behind "modern theology" in teaching no proper personal life-relation between God and mankind, but only a communion of aim, which gives him finally only the trias of, confidence in God, faithfulness in calling, and universal love of mankind, all of which Lipsius declares, is a more pitiful expression for the specific contents of Christianity than the trias of the old rationalism, God, Free Will, and Immortality. He objects to Ritschl's doctrine of sin, because in it the element of inherited tendency of nature is entirely struck out, and sin is judged as sin of ignorance, so far as the true knowledge of sin is supposed to come solely from the gospel. The rejection of original sin is partly covered in Ritschl's sys-

³ Cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. ii, 1884, pp. 184-186, and Vol. v, 1888, pp. 223-226.

tem by the great responsibility which, we are told, it lays upon each man. Nösgen finds that, especially in the assurance of faith, a central point in Luther's theology, Ritschl's teachings afford us no comfort.¹ He nowhere gives us a clear idea of the nature of faith. It is "the subjective form of the peculiar dependence upon God, which is possible in the Christian religion, at the same time, the form in which the dependence as such is affirmed." So, Nösgen says, it is not trust in a personal Redeemer, but it is an immemorizing into the world, which is ordered and ruled by God. Other faith than this Ritschl regards as the mysticism of Francis of Assisi. He makes the co-ordinate of trust in the exercise of faith to be *self-consciousness*, a very different idea from the humility associated in the Scriptures with faith. He considers faith, further, as *obedience* to the revelation made in Christ ; the certainty in it he calls a kind of feeling, a pleasure. Nösgen objects to this, that our obedience can never give assurance before God. A third presentation of faith given by Ritschl refers to knowledge ; he calls it a "loving, personal conviction, brought to pass by means of the feeling of the value of the grace of God known in Christ." Here, too, Nösgen finds nothing but a judgment of knowledge, and how little such judgments can give subjective certainty all the history of philosophy shows.

In a review of Hermann's book, *The Intercourse of the Christian with God*, Kohlschmidt finds the two principles in his theology to be, (1) the exclusion of all that is mystical from the Christian religion, and, (2) in connection

¹ *Die Glaubensgewissheit eine Illusion bei Ritschl's Theologie*, in *Ztft. f. Kirchl. Wissenschaft u. K. Leben.* 1887. Hh. 8, 9, 10.

with that, the exclusive revelation of God's salvation in the historic appearance of Christ. To this the critic objects, that it confounds the common, pantheistic mysticism of mere nature, and true Christian mysticism, which in deep reverence seeks rest and peace in God. And of the second point Kohlschmidt says, that to limit God's revelation to the historic Christ is to isolate this historic appearance from all the religious life of humanity, and the belief in a divine Providence, making Christ's revelation an abrupt, unconnected event in the religious development of our race.¹

VI. THE CHURCHES OF GREAT BRITAIN.

The Methodist movement was the most important revival in the Church of England, in the eighteenth century, as the Anglo-Catholic, or High Church movement has been the most striking in our own century. A recent study by Stokes shows¹ in a very interesting way how the teachings of John Wesley helped produce the Oxford school of Pusey and Newman. He points out that the views of Alexander Knox, (d. 1831) a North of Ireland gentleman, "sounded the first note of a movement which has changed the face of the English Church." He was a high churchman, he was a religious mystic, and that at a time "when mysticism was utterly foreign to the spirit of the

¹ For a comparative statement of Confessional Theology, see Plitt, *Grundriss der Symbolik für Vorlesungen*, 2d. Ed., enlarged by Wiegand. Erlangen: Deichert, 1888. M. 3. Fragmentary, but useful for teachers.

¹ *Alexander Knox and the Oxford movement*, in *The Contemporary Review*. Aug. 1887.

age." And, what is most interesting historically, Knox himself traced all his new ideas to the teaching of Wesley; so that, strange to hear, the fatherhood of the Oxford movement is to be attributed, not to Rose, or Pusey or Newman, but to the great Methodist of the preceding century. Stokes sharply distinguishes the party of Whitefield from that of Wesley; the one being Calvinistic and Puritan, the other Arminian, Anglican, and Sacramental. The controversy between them is well known. At the Bristol Conference of Methodists, held in 1770, the Anglican, or seventeenth century view of justification was accepted. This view Knox adopted, and transmitted to the Oxford Tractarians. "These statements," Stokes assures us, "admit of the fullest demonstration." The high churchman of to-day lauds and praises Wesley; and that is just the revolution in thought which Knox predicted. Justification, sanctification, the two sacraments, the Christian priesthood, the Eucharistic sacrifice, on all these points Wesley and Knox set forth the teachings of the Caroline Divines against Whitefield and the Evangelical party. Wesley was a high churchman in those days, in opposition to the Low Church Evangelicals, and Knox was the medium through which his views passed into the modern High Church party. Wesley held baptismal regeneration, he held high views of the Real Presence, he held to the use of prayers for the dead—all of which Knox passed over to the Oxford men, largely through his intimate relations with Bishop Jebb.

Abbey treats at length of the whole Methodist movement in an elaborate Church history of the eighteenth

century in England.¹ Of Wesley and his work, he says that he long thought that both might have been kept within the Episcopal Church by a little forbearance and sympathy ; but he now concludes that such a result was not possible. The English Church of the last century, he thinks, could not honestly combine with Methodism, “neither could Wesley, thinking as he did, have honestly accepted its organized support.” He shows that the Georges nominated far less worthy bishops than such a king as Charles II. did, while those under Queen Anne were much superior to the later nominees. The Georges made political bishops ; they must be Whig in polities and Low Church in theology. Dull, safe mediocrity was the rule. Abbey deplores the suppression of Convocation, but admits that it gave provocation to the government. Of the churchmen under Queen Anne also, he must say that in dealing with Dissenters their action “can hardly be called by any milder name than persecution.” Much less tolerant is Proby, who has written the *Annals of the “Low-Church” Party in England*,² to show that it “has no moral position in the Church of England at all.” He holds that the Prayer Book was the work of “Reformers” but not “Protestants ;” and, their teachings

¹ *The English Church and its Bishops, 1700–1800.* London, 1887. The following books, on the earlier history, we know only by name : *The Life, Times and Writings of Thomas Cranmer, the first Reforming Archbishop of Canterbury.* By C. H. Collette. London : Redway, 1887 ; and *The Bishops in the Tower. A Record of Stirring Events affecting the Church and Nonconformists from the Restoration to the Revolution.* By H. M. Luckock, London : Rivingtons. 6s.

² Vol. I. J. T. Hayes. London, 1888.

were both Scriptural and Catholic. Hence Low Churchmen, denying "Baptismal Regeneration, the validity of priestly absolution, or the authority of the Church in controversies of faith ought not to be admitted to holy orders." Proby does not hesitate to call Low Churchmen, who appeal to the courts of law against High Church practices, "designing scoundrels," and libellers! Such a very fallible spirit, joined to such infallible pretensions, savors not a little of the mediaeval Papacy with its policy of rule or ruin.

VII. THE AMERICAN CHURCHES.

Schaff has written an Essay on the distinctive character of American Christianity in its organized aspect and as related to the national life.¹ This distinctive character, the great contribution that America has made to the progress of the Church, is "a free Church in a free state," with all the blessings that seem to flow from such relations. Here is found a barrier to all persecution, and a perpetual guarantee for both religion and liberty. The American theory separates Church and State, not in antagonism, but in a relation of respect and mutual sympathy. The Republic is Christian, not infidel, though it establishes no form of Christianity. The law of the land recognizes churches, Sunday, oaths, the Bible, prayer in legislatures, chaplains in the army and navy, and the courts of the land declare Christianity to be part of the Constitution of the Republic.

¹ *Church and State in the United States*, in *Papers of the Amer. Hist. Association*. Vol. ii, No. 4. G. P. Putnam's Sons : New York, 1888. \$1.00

How such a system works, when applied in the freest possible way to the most diverse classes and nationalities, is well illustrated by Dorchester in his recent book on Christianity in America.¹ He traces three great elements in our religious life, (1) Protestantism, (2) Roman Catholicism, and (3) a variety of elements, which follow no organic unity. Among these "Diverse currents," special attention is given to the "Unitarian trend," of which, it is said, that "the exciting point in this conflict was the question of 'a change of heart,'" and the "French-American Infidelity;" both of which appeared in the first period 1776 to 1800. After the Revolutionary War greater liberality prevailed in religious beliefs, followed by the growth of Unitarianism on the one hand, and greater toleration of Roman Catholicism on the other. The second period, 1800 to 1850, he finds to have been the time of revival, "New Life in the Protestant Churches," and "An era of Revivals inaugurated." In the "Mississippi Valley" he traces the "New Life expanding;" and the "New Life" organizing takes shape in Home Missions, Foreign Missions, and the many evangelical agencies. In the last period, 1850 to the present, the author puts a heading "Convergent Currents," under which he traces better tendencies, such as "From Atheism to Theism." Dorchester deals largely in statistics. Some of his results are as follows: From 1800 to 1850, there was an increase, in America, of 40,000 churches, 23,000 ministers, and 3,200,000 members in the "evangelical" Protestant denominations; equal to about 800 churches a

¹ *Christianity in the United States from the first Settlement down to the Present Time.* New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1888.

year, with 600,000 members. In the next twenty years, 1850 to 1870, the churches increased by 37,000, and the members by 3,100,000, nearly as much as in the preceding fifty years. Between 1870 and 1880, the growth has been 27,000 churches and 3,400,000 members, while between 1880 and 1886, the rate has again increased to 344,449 members per annum, as against 339,258, in the preceding decade. Of the Roman Catholic Church, he says, it grew from 100,000, in 1850, to 1,161,000, in 1885 ; but the Protestant population has grown just about as fast as the general population. It was 32,000 less than half the nation, in 1850, and, in 1880, it was only 35,000 less than half. Between 1870 and 1886, as compared with 1850 to 1870, the Roman Catholics have declined in their rate of increase, having 890 ministers and 1,180 churches less with 386,000 less church adherents, while the Protestants have 14,520 more ministers, 14,282 more churches, and 8,287,465 more adherents than in the earlier period.¹

The aggressive Protestantism, which is here set forth, is almost exclusively of the orthodox type ; to add to the breadth of our survey, therefore, we will close this section with a brief summary of the results of the “advanced” theology as represented in America by Unitarian divines. This system, or rather this tendency of thought, we are told, has fought (1) to upset “the metaphysical doctrine of a triune God,” which is the “theoretic cornerstone” of the “strange mythology” of orthodoxy ;² (2) it now

¹ For much information on the origin of the Lutheran Church in America, see *Life and Times of Henry M. Mühlenberg* (d. 1787), by W. J. Mann, 1887.

² Cf. Prof. Allen, in *The Unitarian Review*, Sep. 1887.

comes to see that the old controversy turned largely on misunderstanding. Even the doctrine of the trinity is not a mere "corruption" of Early Christianity, "but a development out of conditions and demands of the soul fundamentally religious." It was of great "value in the religious life of Christendom, from its battle with old paganism down to its conflict with the latest forms of materialistic science." Athanasius, we are told, was nearer our modern thought than the paganizing logic of the Arians. Thus, Allen continues, Unitarians must make great concessions, because they see now God in Humanity in a way very much as Athanasius saw God in Christ. But the orthodox, too, are broadening, we are assured, to meet this broadening of the liberals. Unitarianism, we hear, has now passed from controversy; it takes in all liberal Christians. It claims the Unitarians of Hungary, many of the prominent theologians of Germany, the school of Coquerel in France, the liberals in Holland, and, it is said, if Japan accepts Christianity at all, it will be of the free sort. Of liberal Christianity in America, we read further,¹ "The disintegration of orthodoxy is going on more rapidly than the integration of liberalism." We hear that "Unitarianism must be aggressive." More men are called for. But there seems little response to the appeal for liberal ministers to preach a gospel which will win especially thinking men in the West, of whom one-half or two-thirds, it is said, do not go to church. The students of theology in Harvard Divinity school,² between 1872 and 1879, reached twenty-three as the highest number; from 1879 to 1885,

¹ *Unitarian Review*, Nov. 1887, p. 451.

² Cf. *Unitarian Review*, March, 1887.

it has reached only twenty-nine, some years. Another disciple of the free theology calls American Unitarianism of our day "tame and spiritless;"¹ he even believes it "is going backward in usefulness, in vitality, in church soundness." He is distressed, and asks the reason. It is no comfort, he says, to be told that the free theology is at work in "Progressive Orthodoxy" and other movements in other churches; whither shall he go himself? He cannot go to meet "the churches that are coming towards him; he is still repelled by the dishonesty of professing faith in even the remnants of their creed." He cannot go to the free thinkers, for "there he is met by the lack of certain elements of religious worship which they ignore and despise, but which to him are essential to true religion." Prof. J. H. Allen, referring to these questions, quotes a remark in reply as follows: "You Unitarians need two things, in order to go about your work with the proper spirit, to accept the situation, and *to be honestly afraid of something.*" In this last phrase Allen finds a weakness of Unitarianism touched; "a bland gospel of culture, which has learned to despise the terror of the Lord," he thinks, "is the most impotent of equipments for the religious life." If this prevails in Unitarian churches he declares they must go down "the primrose path to deserved annihilation."²

¹ *Unitarian Review*, March, 1888.

² For much valuable information respecting living theologians, see *Encyclopædia of Living Divines and Christian Workers of all Denominations in Europe and America.* By Schaff and Jackson. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

PRESENT STATE
OF
STUDIES IN NATURAL AND REVEALED THEOLOGY.
BY
REV. GEORGE NYE BOARDMAN,
PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

There have been more than the ordinary indications of a want of repose in the theological world during the past year. There seems to be an increasing number of those who assume that Protestant theology is hopelessly shattered. It may not be true that the number of staunch adherents of that theology is diminished, but it is undoubtedly true that much theological thinking flows in other channels.

A change of philosophical views has to some extent modified theological views. The Aristotelianism of the Middle Ages, reaching down in its influence far into the age of the Reformation, long gave color to theological thought and almost dictated theological expression. In later days the philosophy of Kant, followed by that of Hegel, some would say, completed by that of Hegel, has greatly modified religious thought in some minds. Man's relation to God, the nature of sin, the method of deliverance from guilt, are all topics which have to do with philosophy. When it is held that God is no longer the author of positive laws, no longer a ruler keeping watch over his subjects, and man is no longer a subject influenced by moral considerations, to be judged according as his deeds shall be, then a theology of discipline, punishment, and ransom from guilt must be out of place. It may indeed be said that the later philosophy does not destroy a moral

government, but, though many Hegelians have been earnest Christian men, it seems clear that a scheme of thought that makes the very existence of the world a process of the reconciliation of opposites would not make reconciliation between man and law depend on grace.

The doctrine of evolution is also exerting an influence on theological opinions. No one can doubt the truth of this doctrine within a certain range ; development by means of forces in nature is open to the most superficial observation. Hence a scheme of evolution may be easily illustrated and readily made captivating to eager minds. The scheme is, moreover, so generally adopted by students of nature as the true explanation of the world's progress, that those who are ambitious to be abreast with the thought of the age are ashamed to appear skeptical concerning it. The question therefore becomes a pressing one ; can religion and evolution be reconciled ? The replies to the question are various. Some are so bold as to think that evolution is the new light in which the mysteries of revelation can be made plain. Immortality, redemption, pardon, final blessedness of both body and soul are all demonstrable, it is held, through this new scheme of both science and philosophy. A far larger number do not go beyond the attempt to show that evolution is consistent with our revealed religion. If divine interpositions are granted to have taken place here and there, as in the creation of man, —humanizing the animal—and in the introduction of Christ upon the earth, it is thought, the theory of evolution may be accepted without difficulty. But those who have no regard for the Scriptures, and consider theology a fabric which dreamers have constructed, must be expected

to carry out their scheme of evolution to the utmost. To them it is worth nothing if it is to be made subservient to moral considerations and to be modified as the interests of religion require. They, therefore, advocate a scheme of science which is clearly at war with the Bible. Their views make the fall of man an absurdity, make the deterioration of man from a better state to a worse, as a general fact, an impossibility, and make sin merely the laudable attempt to throw off restraints and to rise into a higher freedom.

Again, there are not a few who attempt to reconcile this thoroughgoing evolution with our Christian religion. And as they can not bring evolution into accord with the Bible, they bring the Bible into accord with evolution and claim that Christianity is still untouched, though the Bible is badly mutilated. Thinkers of this class, of course, renounce the doctrine of inspiration and greatly modify their views of redemption.

Still another source of agitation in the theological world is the higher criticism of the Bible. If we are to accept the idea that the Old Testament is a series of laws and ordinances which lie in strata, being the deposits of different ages piled one upon another, having no vital connection with each other, we shall inevitably be compelled to renounce the old orthodox view concerning the authority of the Scriptures. If the bed-rock of the Bible is a few mythical traditions and the lowest tangible material certain disconnected prophecies, if Jeremiah wrote the oldest considerable part of the Pentateuch, and Chronicles was written to counteract the too little partisan view of Samuel and Kings, then we shall not be able to save enough of the old doctrine of inspiration to remind us even of what we

have lost. It is impossible to determine how many accept this view of the structure of the Hebrew Scriptures, but it is certain that many do, who still try to believe that they contain words from God, and that some, claiming to be Christian writers, treat with contempt the supposition that we have the writings of Moses in the Pentateuch, and the supposition that Leviticus is not a code of late authorship constructed in the interests of priestcraft.

The particular subjects in connection with which agitation is now chiefly manifested are the “new departure,” so-called, and inspiration. The former has not been a theme of strictly theological discussion for some years, yet it is its theological element which keeps it before the people. The form of statement in which the new departure is usually set forth is this: “a Christian probation is granted to some persons after death.” No one, however, has seemed to think it worth while to urge the doctrine upon the faith of the world as having value in itself, its adherents have simply asserted their right to hold the doctrine. In this latter claim they have had many sympathizers among those who reject the doctrine. It is perhaps for the sake of enlarging their party, perhaps from the conviction that the doctrine is of little practical worth, that its adherents wage their contest over the question whether it disqualifies one for the work of a teacher of Christian truth. Those who answer this question in the negative, resort to various descriptions of the doctrine in order to set forth its harmlessness. It is said to be a dogma not a doctrine; a supposition not an assertion; a supposition of which we know nothing, which we may therefore cherish as possible; it is said to be a hope—the

natural hope of a tender heart, and therefore to be tolerated—an extra-scriptural hope, and therefore not to be repressed as if it were forbidden by the Scriptures. Those who think that persons under the influence of this doctrine are not prepared to proclaim the scheme of salvation ask, what will prove to be its real import? and with what principles of theology and philosophy will it be found to be connected, when it shall have passed out of its present amorphous condition and shall appear definably constructed? They know that at its first appearance it found its support mainly in two principles,—man's natural relation to Christ and the injustice of condemning any one before he had heard of the salvation in Christ. They believe that it will again, when it shall have acquired recognition, be set upon the same foundation, and that its advocates now, instead of seeking toleration—or rather countenance,—should advocate their doctrine on its merits and let its merits decide its fate.

I. TREATISES ON THEOLOGY AS A SYSTEM.

An important work,¹ treating of most of the principal topics of theology, is that of Eduard Böhl, a Professor of philosophy and theology in Vienna. It is written in a clear style, with much directness and fearlessness of utterance, and with a conscious mastery of the subject in hand. It is, though not emanating from a city associated in thought with Calvinism, a presentation of the Reformed or Calvinistic doctrines. And the author goes back far towards the days of Calvin to find a kindred spirit with whose theological views he can sympathize. He says Heidegger may be considered the last Reformed dogmatist. Heidegger died in 1698 and is prominently known as one of the authors of the Form of Agreement adopted by the Swiss churches in opposition to the modified Calvinism of the Saumer school. Professor Böhl does not, however, attach himself to theologian or to school, but brings forward his views as those taught directly by the Word of God. He considers the Scriptures as the only source of Christian doctrine; to interpret them, however, one must have the aid of the Holy Spirit. “Whoever has not the courage to claim for himself the witness of the Holy Spirit, as the Reformers did, cannot become a teacher; otherwise he is only a hireling. Without this

¹ *Dogmatik. Darstellung der christlichen Glaubenslehre auf reformirt-kirchlicher Grundlage.* Amsterdam, 1887.

witness one is only a false witness."² This witness, he hastens to tell us, is *toto cælo* different from that claimed as coming through the immanence of God of which Dorner speaks.

In constructing his system of doctrine he makes decrees and inspiration the two leading, we might almost say, regulative forces of his scheme. The decrees of God have their end and explanation in God himself. We are not to attempt any ethical explanation of them, are not to seek their purpose in the happiness or the holiness of the creature. It is not for us to speculate concerning the secret things of God. He relies with equal assurance on the inspiration of the Scriptures; that is the warrant for the truth of whatever is contained in the Bible. His anthropology is that of our theologians described by the term old-school; the will is free because it follows the dictates of the understanding, character as well as existence may be imparted by creation, man was created in righteousness and true holiness. Adam's sin is imputed to us and our personal sin is perversion of relations and not connected with the substance of man. "What we call sin is an accident which installs itself through a perverted attitude as well as by the absence of previous life-conditions; but sin is nothing substantial, only the aim is different and has become perverted. What descends by inheritance in all directions is, according to Rom. v, 12, death, but not at all a corrupt seed of sin which should be transmitted by natural descent from Adam. The means by which death comes upon all men is the divine ordinance and imputa-

² P. xx.

tion. Death, which through the one transgression came upon all the race, is the root of all the sins of the individual.”¹

It is amusing to notice the fearlessness and self-confidence with which Böhl describes the various positions of modern theologians. Schleiermacher gave up the Bible and put the religious feelings in its place, hence he makes humanity, when it bursts the cocoon, come out a Christophorus; Biedermann is a pantheist; Biedermann and Lipsius have no God to whom one can pray; Frank is a synergist; Ritschl has no standards, puts ethical judgment in the place of metaphysics, has no trinity, is a semipelagian and a deist. He says that Dorner, in order to establish faith on a purely human basis, fell into the error that God’s immanence in us is the perennial and ever-present ground of our existence. He quotes from Dorner: “To the endowment of human intelligence belongs also the power of intuition, the plastic power of thinking God’s real thoughts after him and of mirroring his truths in a living representation;” and adds, “Whoever grants Dorner this, delivers himself up to him bound hand and foot, and may see to it, how he shall get loose again.”² Böhl’s critics are equally cool in their judgment of him. Lipsius says: “All the principal questions concerning theories of religious knowledge, the essence of religion, the relation of theology and philosophy trouble this favorite of fortune so little that he does not think them worth the trouble of a notice;” and dismisses the book with the remark: “The chief peculiarity of the work is a use of scripture-proofs which laughs at all modern criticism and exegesis.”

¹ P. 208. ² P. ix.

The work of Professor Shedd,¹ consisting of two volumes, 1,300 pages, is in closest sympathy with ancient orthodoxy. While the author does not undervalue the brilliant and practical productions of modern times, he does not hesitate to avow his preference for the thinking of the great theologians of past generations. His admiration of Augustine has long been known, the work before us shows that he has patiently and carefully reproduced in his own mind the speculations of Athanasius, Anselm, Calvin, Edwards and others with whose words he has enriched many of his pages. Every topic which he discusses is worthy of extended notice, but we have space for only two—*theism* and the *atonement*. Possibly we may at another time turn back to speak of some of the characteristic features of these volumes, but they have come to us too late for full review at present. A great part of the first volume is devoted to theology in the narrower sense,—the doctrine of God; and nearly one half to the existence, nature and attributes of deity. We shall confine ourselves mainly to his idea of the nature of God and of the proofs of his existence.

The opening sentence on this subject is instructive and suggestive: “The words of our Lord to the Samaritan woman, ‘God is a spirit,’ although spoken for a practical purpose, are also a scientific definition.” He objects, however, to the ordinary translation and says: “He is not *a* spirit, but spirit itself, absolutely. The employment of the article in the English version is objectionable, because it places the deity in a class with other spiritual

¹ *Dogmatic Theology*. By William G. T. Shedd, D. D. New York. Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1888.

beings. But this is not the thought of Christ, who asserts that ‘no one knoweth the Father but the Son ; thus claiming for himself a knowledge of the deity as the absolute and unconditioned spirit, who is not cognizable by the finite mind in the manner and degree that finite spirit is.’¹ While God is spirit he is possessed of *substance* or *essence*; he is not simply an idea, not the absolute idea, neither is he an energy inferred from the current of events, “a power that makes for righteousness,” but a being capable of possessing and exercising powers and influences. Again “God has no passions.” He does not so exist over against anything as to be subject to its sway, liable to be thwarted or in any way affected by its forces. He is master of himself and of all things. Besides essence he predicates of God personality. “God is a personal being. Personality is marked by two characteristics, self-consciousness, self-determination.” If this be true, then God distinguishes himself from the Universe, forms plans, governs the world and may make a revelation. The author replies to the objection that personality is a denial of the infinity of God by pointing out the important and fundamental truth that the Infinite is not the All. “The Infinite is without parts and indivisible ; the All is made up of parts and is divisible.”² He thinks Edwards and Dorner fell into the error of confounding the Infinite and the All. Professor Shedd considers the idea of God innate to the human mind. His argument on this point is extended and powerful. After remarking that the Bible combats atheism only in the form of practical atheism, he says : “The reason why the Scriptures make no provision

¹ *Ibid.* p. 151. ² *Ibid.* p. 190.

against speculative atheism by syllogistic reasoning is, that syllogistic reasoning starts from a premise that is more obvious and certain than the conclusion drawn from it, and they do not concede that any premise necessary to be laid down in order to draw the conclusion that there is a Supreme being, is more intuitively certain than the conclusion itself. The judgment, "There is a God," is as universal, natural and intuitive as the judgment, "There is a cause." The latter judgment has been combated (by Hume, e. g.), as well as the former. And the principal motive for combating the latter is the invalidation of the former. Men deny the reality of a cause, only for the purpose of disproving the reality of a First Cause.¹ The evidence of the innateness of the idea of God which the author finds in psychology seems to us not wholly convincing. He says: "Atheism is refuted by an accurate and exhaustive psychology." This need not be denied. But when he argues the fact first from man's *God-consciousness*, this seems to us very like begging the question, which is whether the idea of God comes within consciousness. To reply, it must be within the consciousness, for the reality is there, at least makes the question futile. When he says that self-consciousness proves that the idea of God is in the mind, because there must be a self over against the conscious self to make that form of consciousness possible, we cannot assent. There is no evidence that the subject and object in consciousness must be co-equal, or even the same in kind. When he maintains that a sinful self proves the idea of a holy creator, we ask what would a holy self prove? There seems to us a subtle

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 196.

realism underlying some of the argumentations of Prof. Shedd on the subject of theism. At times it seems as if he held knowing and being to be one. This appears, perhaps, still more fully in his *argument* for the existence of God.

The evidence of the divine existence, as our author thinks, is mainly our consciousness, yet he considers the syllogistic arguments useful. He presents appreciatively the cosmological argument and recognizes the Bible endorsement of it. It is gratifying to see this at a time when it is fashionable to deny this and other proofs of God's existence. Critics treat these arguments of late as if their purpose were to define God, not to certify us of his being. Men who would be ridiculed as simpletons if they did *not* know Hercules from his footprints, are ridiculed as simpletons if they *do* know God from his works. Our author, however, gives the most prominent place to the ontological argument, and considers Anselm's form of it irrefutable. But he seems to us to beg the question in his defence of it. Anselm attempts to go from the idea of a perfect being to the existence of the perfect being. The medium by which the idea is assured to be the idea of an objective reality is the idea of necessary existence as an attribute of the idea of a perfect being. Professor Shedd seems to think the *idea* of necessary existence compels an assent to the *fact* of necessary existence. In his view the mind has not the power to hold the idea of necessary existence as an idea, while it is an idea it is an objective reality. The very idea carries over the mind into the apprehension of the objective truth. In other words you cannot say a being exists necessarily without

proving that he exists necessarily. He says the statement, "If the absolutely Perfect exist, he exists necessarily," is self-destructive. The word *necessarily* nullifies the *if*. It will not do to say *God* exists necessarily and then prove his existence from the word necessarily, this is begging the question; but the argument fails unless the word necessarily in some way establishes the existence of God.

Professor Shedd notices the objections which have been urged against this argument and replies to them, but it seems to us not conclusively, unless the idea of necessity of existence is the evidence of the reality of a necessary existence. He says the objections are made, in some cases, against the Cartesian form of the argument and against that are valid, but not against the Anselmic. Yet the two differ only in this, that Des Cartes omits the statement of the middle step in the process, viz., necessary existence. Des Cartes goes from most perfect being, as an idea, to objective reality, Anselm goes from the same to the included idea *necessary existence*, and from that to objective reality. It is difficult to see how the mere failure to state an implied thought should invalidate an argument. Of the entire argument it may be said that an element in a given idea cannot be evidence of a reality to which the idea corresponds. A plausible argument in favor of reality may be derived from the source of the idea or from its relations.

The wealth of thought which the author spreads out before the reader in his chapters on the Trinity and on the attributes of God, will call forth admiration and gratitude, but we can not take up these themes here. These prolonged meditations upon the Deity are the fruitage of habits of thought long since established, already noticeable

when the author was a youthful pastor in a Vermont village.

We pass now to notice briefly his view of the atonement. He teaches with great positiveness the doctrine of vicarious atonement. He considers that it is clearly taught in the Scriptures, in those passages which declare that Christ gave himself a ransom for many, died for our sins, died for the ungodly. He finds substitution of Christ for the sinner implied in the Greek prepositions which set forth his relation to men. He calls attention to the difference between a personal and a vicarious atonement. The offending party makes a personal atonement by suffering the penalty of his own sin. A vicarious atonement is made by the offended party,—in our Christian system made by God: “our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.” In the case under consideration, the particular function to be performed is that of atoning for sin by suffering. Man the transgressor is the party who owes the atonement, and who ought to discharge the office of an atoner; but Jesus Christ is the party who actually discharges the office, and makes the atonement in his stead. The idea of vicariousness or substitution is, therefore, vital to a correct theory of Christ’s priestly office.¹

To the objection that there is no mercy in the pardon of sin if the penalty is paid by a substitute, Professor Shedd replies: “The highest exhibition of mercy is the substitutional character of the atonement. For God to remit penalty without inflicting suffering upon God incarnate, would be infinitely less compassion than to remit it through such infliction. In one case, there is no self-sacrifice in the

¹ *Ibid.* p. 382.

Godhead; in the other there is. The pardon in one case is inexpensive and cheap; in the other costly and difficult of execution."¹

In this connection the author speaks of the self-sacrifice of the Father in providing the atonement. To this thought he recurs more frequently than to any other. "Though it was God the Son, and not God the Father, who became incarnate, and suffered, and died, it by no means follows that the first person of the Trinity made no self-sacrifice in this humiliation and crucifixion of the second person."² "In looking, therefore, for the immost seat and center of the Divine compassion, we should seek it rather in the work of atonement than in the act of forgiveness. . . . The latter transaction is easy enough after the former has occurred. But the former transaction cost the infinite and adorable Trinity an effort, and a sacrifice, that is inconceivable and unutterable."³

To the objection that making atonement to one's self means nothing, that the thought is artificial and nugatory he replies: "The explanation of the great subject of the Divine reconciliation lies in the doctrine of the Trinity. The doctrine of vicarious atonement stands or falls with that of the Triune God."⁴ Jesus Christ does not make satisfaction to himself as Jesus Christ, but to the Trinity. The incarnate Word satisfies the justice of the God-head."⁵

The author notices that some who accept the doctrine of a vicarious sacrifice yet deny that Christ's sufferings were penal. He, however, prefers to retain that word since his sufferings were not a calamity befalling him for no known

¹ *Ibid.* p. 384.

² *Ibid.* p. 386.

³ *Ibid.* p. 393.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 408.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 394.

purpose, were not discipline, for he was not undergoing a process of sanctification, but were a satisfaction to the claims of the law, and those claims were the penalty due for transgression. The term punishment may describe Christ's sufferings as fitly as atonement does. They are kindred terms.

Professor Shedd affirms the adequacy of the substitution of Christ's sufferings in the place of the sinner's in very emphatic language. "The vicarious sufferings of Christ were *infinite in value*. In the substitution, the amount is fully equal to that of the original penalty." "It has been objected that the sufferings of Christ, not being endless, cannot be of equal value with those of all mankind. But when carefully examined and strictly computed, they will be found to exceed in value and dignity the sufferings for which they were substituted."¹ This remark is based on two considerations, that the element of infinity enters into the sufferings of Christ more fully than into those of men, and that the law is more fully honored by the substitution, since it is *obeyed* by Christ at the same time that its penalty is endured. He teaches that the expiation of sin was effected both by Christ's active and passive obedience.

As to the extent of the atonement the author says: "Atonement is unlimited, and redemption is limited. This statement includes all the Scripture texts; those which assert that Christ died for all men, and those which assert that he died for his people."² Concerning the responsibility of the non-elect he says: "It is the non-elect himself, not God, who prevents the efficacy of the atonement."

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 459-460.

² *Ibid.* p. 470.

“The author of impenitence and unbelief is the author of limited redemption.” “The non-elect himself is the responsible cause of the inefficacy of Christ’s expiation.”¹

The theology of Ritschl continues to excite interest in all European countries and to some extent in America. An essay was read before an association of Swiss preachers in August, 1887, which contains some points worthy of notice. Its author, Dr. Th. Häring, is a professor of theology at Zürich and shows himself familiar with the topics of which he treats. The question which he answers is this: “Does Ritschl’s theory of the atonement constitute an advance in the dogmatic development of Protestant theology?” He finds the same difficulties which others have encountered in the study of his author; indefiniteness of thought, indefiniteness of statement, the use of old terms in a new sense, appeal to relations which are not defined; yet he maintains that he has made important contributions to theological science. He states a few of the principles of his theology with clearness and brevity which we will give very nearly in his words: Sin in its religious and moral character is want of reverential trust, on this ground is based want of love to one’s neighbor, and, through the interaction of wicked wills, the kingdom of sin; the atonement is the restoration of right relations with God; forgiving grace is not at variance with the inviolability of moral law, but is the highest moral love—this is the peculiarly Christian sentiment concerning God; the forgiveness of sin is not a mere sentiment of God relating to the sinner, but implies the appropriation of grace and is the foundation of practical Christian life, it is not the surrogate of

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 484–485.

defective good works, but a divine judgment which is synthetic; Christ is the perfect revelation of God; God's love is revealed not only in sending Christ, but is self-revealing in his life-work; man's relation to God is not essentially a relation of justice, as the old orthodoxy holds, or a relation of dependence on arbitrary power, as the Socinians teach, but of dependence on forgiving love to be appropriated by faith; the Christian knows that he is called to enter into communion with God, but a sense of guilt restrains him. Christianity brings with it the assurance of reconciliation, which is forgiveness, which is justification; no moral consideration is to be thought of as calling forth God's judgment of justification or as establishing it as a fact. Professor Häring considers these views a decided advance in theology; the old orthodoxy he supposes to have been overthrown by the Kantian philosophy and the speculations of Schleiermacher. Ritschl has now gone back to the Bible and brought forth from it a scheme which accords both with Christian experience and revealed truth. This is not a scheme which depends on any philosophy, Ritschl discards metaphysics as connected with religion, but is a scheme which rests simply on the fact of Christ's work. We are reconciled with God, or, in other words, an atonement is made, when we believe in Christ. This is the perpetual miracle of the Christian religion. We are reconciled to God, or atonement is made, not through any merit of Christ, though his work has value before God and is pleasing to him, but through his person, he being our representative. We find absolutely no favor with God except through Christ. It is only the faith which

Christ, historically known, creates in us, that makes us acceptable to God. And Christ is acceptable to God and creates faith in us only by his death. His death was absolutely essential to constitute him a Reconciler between God and man. The death of Christ, however, was not a vicarious enduring of punishment ; this is an unbiblical idea and would have no tendency towards a reconciliation. It is effective because it has a faith-producing power and because it was a faithful fulfilling of Christ's calling.

While Professor Häring accepts much of Ritschl's teaching, he considers his views of expiation defective, and that the Bible embraces much concerning the atonement that is not recognized in this scheme. He thinks there are still advances to be made in Protestant theology. American theologians will find, with many differences, many similarities between Ritschl's theology and the views of Dr. Bushnell.

The work of Stuart¹ deserves notice rather as an indication of certain theological tendencies of the time, than for its inherent worth. It is not wholly consistent with itself; it presents no standard of belief, after having destroyed, or attempted to destroy, that ordinarily received, viz. inspiration ; and it is utterly capricious in its acceptance or rejection of Scripture statements ; still it has qualities which entitle it to careful study. It is an honest and vigorous attempt to draw forth from the Bible the doctrines of Christianity. It throws off all authority, whether of commentators or theologians, it repels all meta-

¹ *Principles of Christianity*. Being an essay towards a more correct apprehension of Christian doctrine, mainly soteriological. By James Stuart, M. A. Williams & Norgate. London : 1888.

physical subtleties and seeks from the Bible itself to make out the teachings of the Bible. One is reminded, in reading it, of Ritschl's method of theological discussion. There is little similarity of results in the speculations of the two men, but they are alike in the fearless and independent way in which they treat biblical commentators and other theological writers. The work before us, though giving evidence of the author's familiarity with the literature of theology, is singularly free from any attempt to find support or confirmation in the works of others.

The author does not attempt to give the world an entire system of theology, but aims to present what he considers the correct view of the chief doctrines of the scheme of salvation. He begins with a determined and prolonged assault upon the doctrine of imputation. He claims to have demonstrated its utter absurdity, its inconsistency with itself and with the Scriptures. He selects the case of Onesimus as one exhibiting the true idea of imputation, in which the guilt of wrong-doing is transferred from him to Paul. He affirms that the theological doctrine does not, in any of its applications, teach a transfer either of sin or of guilt. Adam retains his guilt, though his sin, according to the doctrine, is imputed to his posterity; men retain their guilt and sin, though their sin is said to be imputed to Christ; and men live lives of sin, though Christ's righteousness is imputed to them. There is therefore no imputation, no transfer of character or quality from one to another, there is, even according to the doctrine itself, merely a *conferring* of sin, guilt or righteousness, so that the several individuals involved have common part in the same qualities. The author argues at

great length that neither reason, experience nor Scripture gives any support to the doctrine.

This "eliminating the theory or doctrine of imputation" from theology opens the way to the position that God judges every man according to his character,—the good man is rewarded, the bad man is punished. The author maintains that there are no fictions in theology, forgiveness is actual forgiveness, not a transfer of righteousness from one to another, punishment is actual and for personal sin, whether inflicted on Christ or on men, and is never vicarious, suffering is penal, not simply chastisement, and righteousness is an actual quality of character, never an assumed quality.

He maintains also that the Scriptures are to be interpreted from the standpoint of those to whom they are addressed. They have no double meaning, are not to be understood as allegorical, but are to be accepted in their original intent. If they have been quoted, as they often are in the New Testament, in a sense different from the original, the new sense is to be discarded, and neither the new nor the old is to be imposed upon us by a resort to the doctrine of inspiration. Verbal inspiration and allegorical exegesis, in the author's view, go together.

Mr. Stuart is one of the boldest critics of the Bible. He accepts as true, or as in all probability true, the results of the higher criticism, and accepts the results of scientific research as at war with many Scriptural assertions and yet as indubitably established. Intelligent men cannot, in his view, receive the account of the creation of man which we have in Genesis, and cannot accept the story of the fall as historical. He says: "It appears to be quite clearly made out that we have at the opening of

Genesis not one account of creation but two, and two accounts which originated quite independently of one another, and are, in various details, such, for example, as the order of creation, mutually antagonistic and utterly irreconcilable. Of these two narratives, the second, which contains the account of the fall, is probably the older, but neither can be assigned to a date earlier than the ninth century B. C.¹⁴ He finds a relation between the Old Testament and the New, but does not allow that the latter is, in any sense, a development of the former; the relation is that of continuity, not that of unity. He says: "Historical critics of the more sober-minded and earnest class are inclining more and more to the opinion that the sacrificial and ceremonial system of the Israelitish nation was not of positive Divine institution, but of natural origin, just as much so as the sacrificial systems of the heathen; that in the earliest ages it was of a simple nature, and as nearly as possible identical, in its general character, with that which existed among the surrounding nations: that, though accepted by the God of Israel as a convenient form in which religious feeling might develop and expand itself, it was at no time regarded by the best spirits of the nation as entering into the essence of true religion, or as being in itself anything more than a matter of indifference; that the ceremonial system in its most fully developed written form—the form in which it appears in the middle books of the Pentateuch—did not take shape, or at any rate did not come into actual practice, till after the Babylonian exile; and, finally, that long before the Christian era the written law had been

greatly augmented by unwritten additions, and, instead of being a help, had become a positive hindrance to the progress of true religion, and was ripe for being swept out of existence, as soon as some great prophet or religious reformer should appear to tear off the mask under which ungodliness and immorality were parading themselves in the name of religion."¹

Christ is, of course, looked upon as the great reformer who set aside traditions and carried forward the religious ideas of men to a higher plane. He made use of the Old Testament as an aid, but while he appealed to it he really set it aside. He did not think it necessary to remove from the minds of his contemporaries their errors concerning its origin and its historic truthfulness, he simply sought to cultivate a true religion of the heart by such means as were within his reach. "What Christ and his apostles had to do, and what all religious reformers in similar circumstances, both before and since, have had to do, has been to tear off the mask of outward formalism, and to lead men back to religion of the heart. The sum of all that Christ and his apostles taught was that men should obtain through faith a new heart, which would enable them to love God and their fellow-men, and that beyond this everything was a matter of absolute indifference."²

The apostles, when they subsequently proceeded to publish and advocate Christianity, made use of such arguments as they found effective among the people. They sought to draw away their hearers from the law which hindered their spiritual advancement but to which they

¹ P. 393.

² P. 390.

were wedded; they therefore attempted to persuade their hearers that the law was fulfilled in Christ and might safely be set aside. They thus read Christianity into the Old Testament that they might through the law enforce it upon the people. This apostolic exegesis of the Scriptures was an artifice but served a good purpose. Paul resorts to shuffling and sophistry to establish his views by means of the sacred books, but we are not to be misled by his interpretations or false inferences. We are to distinguish between his personal ideas and the principles of Christianity. It is for us to set aside his whimsies, such as original sin and death because of the sin of Adam, to detect his Rabbinical prejudices and separate from them the doctrines of salvation which he has set forth correctly, having derived his knowledge of them from personal experience.

The author says that the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle to the Hebrews are the two pillars of Christian doctrine. The perversions of the Old Testament by the author of the latter Epistle are more monstrous than those of Paul. He makes Christ a priest before he died, then a priest after he died, teaches that there was no possible salvation before Christ came, yet teaches in the latter part of the Epistle that many in early times walked by faith. Thus there are two or three contradictory systems in the Hebrews in reference to which we must be on our guard.

It is somewhat difficult to understand how our author discriminates between the true and the false in the New Testament writings, but he seems to accept with implicit confidence and as final authority much of the gospels and of the epistles.

The question will be asked, what, in the view of Stuart, is salvation? If there is no original sin, if there has been no fall, from what are men saved? The reply is salvation is deliverance from sin, not from guilt and punishment except incidentally, but from sin. Salvation is the result of righteousness, the state of salvation is the state of righteousness. God does not deal with fictions but facts. He was always ready to justify those who would keep the law, and always condemns those who transgress it. None are ever justified till they cease from transgression. God does not exact the full penalty for sin in the case of those who believe in Christ and enter on a holy life, on the contrary, he forgives and delivers them from final condemnation. But they are under his wrath till they become righteous, and are never delivered from sin till they put off the flesh. So long as they are in the flesh they suffer for sin and this suffering is penal; it was penal in the case of Christ and is penal with all men. This punishment is like the eternal punishment of the lost, a condemnation of sin and an exhibition of divine wrath. It is not necessary to inflict an adequate punishment for sin; even eternal punishment is not an adequate punishment.

Sin, in our author's view, is an inherent principle of flesh. Flesh is always sinful, God's anger goes forth against it wherever it appears. He was angry with Christ because of it and is angry with all the human race in the same way. While all men are sinful because of the flesh, and all suffer and die because of it, Christ among the number, the spirit is righteousness. The flesh lusts against the spirit and draws it away from its integrity, but so long as it resists temptation the man may be considered

righteous, that is, he will be righteous when he dies, if the spirit remain pure. No man is strong enough of himself to resist temptation, but he may resist it through the aid of the Spirit of God. By the aid of this Divine Spirit Christ kept the spirit sinless, and men may live a life like his by the aid of the spirit received through faith. There is no complete salvation except through death. After death sin is not possible, there is no means by which temptation can have access to the soul, even though the soul is already contaminated by sin. "The flesh is not only a part of the world, but being in immediate contact with the spirit, it is that part through which, directly or indirectly, *all* the world's temptations come. Again, the devil and his emissaries can not be viewed as sources of temptation wholly distinct from the lusts of the flesh; for it is in and through the lusts of the flesh that the supersensuous powers of evil act on human nature."¹

Christ's salvation was precisely like that of other men. He died to sin by putting off the flesh, was under the wrath of God till that time, and in the days of his flesh resisted its temptations by the aid of the Holy Spirit. His death affected no one but himself directly, though the faith by which others are saved is produced by his death,—by his blood.

One naturally asks, what kind of a Being does Mr. Stuart suppose Christ to be. He has not dwelt upon this topic at length, but one sentence may be cited as an answer. "We know that Christ, when He became man, emptied himself, laying aside the substance and form of Godhead, and assuming the substance and form of slave-hood."²

¹ P. 558.

² P. 612.

It may be asked how the power of Christ is applied to men so that he can be said to become their Saviour. On this the author has not been explicit, but he uses the expression, *the believer's vital union with Christ*, without explaining the meaning of the phrase. He also says: "It was the prodigious influx of the spirit of religion which Christ brought with him into the world, and which he left behind him in the world, that constituted his coming a new era in the religious history of the world."¹

*Non-Biblical Systems of Religion*² is a very entertaining and instructive book. It consists of a series of essays first published in *The Homiletic Review*. A little volume of 243 pages, presenting the thoughts of nine able scholars on topics over which they have spent years of study, must be worthy of a careful perusal. And it is very gratifying to notice the honor paid to Christianity by men who know how it stands in contrast with the other religions of the world. The maxim "a little learning is a dangerous thing" is seldom more manifestly true than when essays like those before us are set in contrast with the opinions of sciolists who find Buddhism or the Religion of Humanity superior to Christianity. Some have attempted to account for the Mosaic legislation by tracing it to the jurisprudence of Egypt. Some theologians have claimed to find nearly all the teachings of the Bible in Egyptian theology. But Canon Rawlinson says: "The fact was, that the Egyptian system, whatever amount of truth it contained—and we are far from denying that

¹ P. 390.

² A Symposium. By Ven. Archdeacon Farrar and others. New York. Thomas Whittaker, 1888.

the amount was considerable—rested on no sound basis, was a fabric built up by fancy out of very questionable materials, and involved much false teaching of a practically dangerous character, against which Moses had to guard his countrymen.”¹ He speaks also of Egyptian morality as mostly negative, its positive requirements as being few and easily kept. “It inculcated no severe self-denial, no stern control of the passions, no love of enemies, no turning of the cheek to the smiter, no humility, no real purity, no complete resignation to the divine will under all circumstances.”²

The essay on Buddhism by T. W. Rhys Davids, LL. D., is one of much interest. This religion of the East has by some writers been compared with Christianity to the disparagement of the latter as a debtor to, and in imitation of, the former. Our essayist expresses himself on this point quite decisively. “There has been, it is true, no little wild talk about the borrowings of Christianity from Buddhism. But there has not as yet been discovered the slightest scintilla of evidence for any historical connection between the two. . . . The fact is, that Buddhism is the most different from Christianity of all the great religions.”³ After noticing many marked but superficial similarities he says: “It is precisely those ideas in the Bible which are most instinctively and specially Christian, which are not only wanted in, but are absolutely contradicted in, Buddhism. In it we have an ethical system but no law-giver, a world without a Creator, a salvation without eternal life, and a sense of evil, but no conception of pardon, atonement, reconciliation, or redemption.”⁴

¹ P. 39.

² P. 51.

³ P. 115.

⁴ P. 131.

One of the most interesting of the essays before us is that on the Scandinavian Religion. The author holds that it had an origin wholly independent of Christianity, that the most intelligent of its adherents worshiped a spiritual Deity behind the gods known to the people, and that it inspired the ancient Scandinavians to live upright and noble lives.

Comtism and Mormonism are the two religions which the Nineteenth Century has produced. Comtism is the religion of Humanity. Its worship is the worship of that which is worthiest in humanity. In the concrete the proper object of worship is woman. A man should worship his mother or wife or daughter. This religion is simply the naturalist's scheme of morals with forms of worship added. Professor J. Redford Thomson in an essay on this topic says: "Our admiration of much in the teaching and practical life of our Positivist neighbors does not blind us to the fact that what of good there is in them is owing almost entirely to the religion of Christ, which has entered into the structure of the society of which they form a part, nor does it blind us to the fact that the peculiarities of the Positivist doctrine are in themselves indefensible and misleading."¹

Rational Theology,² by J. M. Williams, treats of so many of the Christian doctrines that it may be noticed among the works upon theology in general. The author gives us, with great clearness and perfect independence of all authorities, his views on Calvinism, Conscience, Virtue,

¹ P. 190.

² *Rational Theology*. By John Milton Williams, A. M. Chicago, 1888.

Regeneration, Sovereignty and Free Agency, Atonement, Future Punishment and the Person of Christ. His views on most of these topics will be readily inferred from a few suggestive statements taken from the book itself. After quoting Reid's definition of freedom—power over the determinations of one's own will,—he says: “New Calvinism accepts, Old Calvinism rejects this definition; and just here theology divides into two schools,”¹ and adds, Reid's definition of necessity is Hodge's definition of freedom. He says, the old Calvinists make the *sensibility* the heart, the New Calvinists make the *will* the heart. The Old Calvinists “agree in making regeneration a work wrought by the direct power of the Holy Spirit in the affections, inclinations, impulses and tastes of the sinner—in what the apostle calls the flesh—in something lying back of the will, from which, they claim, volition and choices proceed. There is probably no other doctrine in the whole Hyper-Calvinistic theology to which the New Calvinist takes more emphatic exceptions. . . . Regeneration the New Calvinist lifts into a higher and different department of man's nature. He makes it a change of moral character—a change from ill to well-deserving—from blame to praise-worthiness, and he can not understand how a change wrought in the sensibility *by another* can render its object meritorious, or make a bad man a good man.² These two theologies agree that regeneration is in every case secured by the Spirit of God, but they differ as to the nature of the influence he employs. One makes it physical, the other moral; one force, the other persuasion.”³ The author considers the Edwardian distinction between natural and moral

¹ P. 16.² Pp. 27–28.³ P. 30.

ability of no account. "Conscience is the arbiter only of intentions or motives. It approves of right intentions and of nothing else. . . . Its domain is the whole field of morals."¹ "The choice of this (the welfare of being in general) for its own sake I conceive to be the *essence* and *totality* of virtue."² The governmental theory of the atonement is adopted in this work; God has made it safe to pardon sin by the sacrifice of Christ. The author denies that Christ possessed a human soul and holds to the Kenotic theory of the incarnation and manifestation of the Logos.

An essay³ by Karl Wilhelm Ziegler indicates the drift of religious thought in some parts of Christendom, it may be, a wide-spread tendency of thought. Lipsius in his notices of theological literature⁴ passes it with the simple remark that it is a reproduction of Ritschlian ideas. But it is not a reproduction of those ideas through which Ritschl is best known in this country, and is worthy of a brief notice. Ziegler, confessing that he has himself been one of the freest of free-thinkers, aims to lead his countrymen to the adoption of Christianity, not the Christianity of the Bible but of experience, as the inevitable result of sound and candid thought. He considers that the aim of religion as of morality, is to deliver man from dependence on the world. The root of religion is "*It is I.*" The personal being is of more importance than the world, and the world must be made to serve the person. A just personal,

¹ P. 40. ² P. 87.

³ *Zum Entscheidungskampf um den christlichen Glauben in der Gegenwart*. Tübingen. 1887.

⁴ *Theologischer Jahresbericht*, Leipzig, 1888.

spiritual life is a religious life. It is the mission of man,—of all men—to live this life of elevation above the world. If we value men as we should, we shall esteem them as a capacity for this better life requires, and shall seek to promote in them the realization of their high dignity. This is the proper neighbor-love, loving our neighbors as ourselves. If we start from this moral principle, which is also the sum and substance of practical Christianity, we shall find that we are obliged also to accept the truths of the Christian religion.

In order to reach this result we must begin with practical life. Christianity is to be known from the lives of pious men, not from the Bible. The evidences of Christianity “as drawn out in treatises on that subject” have little force, but experience shows that it is the system which we must accept as best,—and in any science that which experiment shows to be best, is to be adopted. We are to make faith an act of will, then we go on successfully to the result desired; but when religion attempts to rescue us from dependence on the world by making us dependent on a fictitious Deity we remain dependent on the world still. It is from the will-act that we attain to the religious state and to a knowledge of God. “We for our part would be morally active persons, hold the moral good will for the worthiest, and then believe that the personal will is the point from which our morally guided, not unbridled phantasy must make its leap to the Unconditioned.” The author informs us that he has purposely omitted reference to Christ in his essay, but says, if any one asks whether he can have that will-faith which opens the way to belief in a personal God, his reply is, he can make an earnest

effort for it and perhaps there will come to his assistance one who has more power in faith than any other and is near to God as never man has been.

II. TREATISES ON SPECIFIC DOCTRINES.

1. *Apologetics.*

James Martineau has long been known as one of the leading Unitarians of Great Britain. As a teacher, a thinker and an author he stands in the front rank. His many years of study have given him a familiarity with philosophic literature which no young man can have. He seems to be as familiar with Kant and Lucretius as a Christian preacher is with the Bible; he has at command the main thoughts of philosophical authors from Plato to Theodore Parker; he cites Fichte and Hegel as readily as Hamilton and Hume.¹ The opinions of such a writer must on any theme be of value; especially students of theology must seek the acquaintance of one who could write: "We are entitled to say that conscience reveals the living God, because it finds neither content to its aspirations nor victory in its strife, till it touches his infinitude and goes forth from his embrace."²

The work before us is essentially philosophical, though it is entitled "A Study of Religion." It is an attempt to set the main truths of religion on a firm foundation and deals with it not as a matter of experience but of intellec-

¹ *A Study of Religion, Its Sources and Contents.* By James Martineau, D. D., LL. D. 2 Vols. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

² Vol. ii, p. 37.

tual belief. The author has no reference whatever to Christian doctrine but seeks simply to rescue, appropriate and defend our ‘natural faith.’ He says: ‘By religion I understand the belief and worship of Supreme Mind and Will, directing the universe and holding moral relations with human life. This I state as *its essence*; but whatever this essence may necessarily carry as a consequence, or, with the collateral aid of other evidence, may justify us in accepting as true, will also find its place under the category of religion.’¹ He says also: ‘All religion resolves itself into a conscious relation, on our part, to a higher than we;’² and distinguishes between religion and morality in this way: ‘Nothing is so sickly, so paralytic, so desolate, as ‘Moral Ideals’ that are nothing else; like a pale and beautiful estatica that can only look down, and whisper dreams, and show the sacred stigmata, they cannot will or act or love; and their whole power is in abeyance till they present themselves in a living personal being, who secures the righteousness of the universe and seeks the sanctification of each heart. The whole difference on which I have dwelt between morality and religion hangs on this conviction of an Eternal Holiness in correspondence with the individual conscience.’³

His study of religion is therefore a discussion of this question: can we justify the belief, that there is above us a Supreme and Holy Will in such relation to ourselves that we are drawn by its influence to a holier and better life? He answers this question in the affirmative. Before examining the process by which he reaches his conclusion, however, we will notice the ground on which he rests

¹ *Ibid.* p. 16.

² *Ibid.* p. 137.

³ *Ibid.* p. 36.

belief. The basis of conviction, assurance, certitude is an important element in discussions of this nature. And we may say in general he is a common-sense philosopher. He accepts as true our instinctive and inevitable beliefs. He says: "All your self-consciousness is relative, and postulates the *otherness* of the objective term of the relation ; if you arbitrarily deny that postulate, I have nothing to say for it except that it is natural, inherently involved in the very law of thought itself. . . . We take the opposite course, and accept what each faculty reports as to its correlative term. That report is what we call an intuition."¹ In connection with this principle the following is of interest as showing the author's view of the office of metaphysics. "For this is all, I take it, that metaphysics can pretend to accomplish by their scrutiny of the ultimate factors of human knowledge. They discover for us that, for all phenomena of experience, we are obliged to supply in thought a transcendental object as their ground. Think it, we must, but only as the base of that relation ; believe it, we must : for, if we evict it, the phenomena cling to it and go too ; but prove it, we cannot ; since it is impossible for thought, however nimble, to leap beyond its own laws, and see, from a foreign station, whether they tell lies."² On such a basis the author attempts to found our belief in God and the immortality of the soul. He is ready to analyze our acquired thoughts till we reach their original elements and beyond this point, relying on the veracity of our faculties, he takes on trust, "as valid intuitions, the residual belief inherent in our mental constitution."

How are we to find and believe in that Higher which

¹ *Ibid.* p. 2.

² *Ibid.*, p. viii.

we are to worship, if we are to have a religion? The author says there are two conditions of supremacy, *power* and *moral worth*;—power to command all methods needful for the accomplishment of contemplated ends, moral worth which gives ascendancy to the highest ends “as the springs of the divine Will.” He first turns his attention to power as the means by which we are to rise to a knowledge of the existence and power of God, and fixes upon causality as the form of power which leads to this result. God is to be known first as cause. He then enters upon a very careful study of the idea of causality. We cannot follow him in this but must be content with noticing simply the conclusions which he reaches. He rejects the view that a thing is a cause in virtue of being an object in which attributes reside. The view of Spinoza that substance is the cause of all things cannot be accepted: “except as the seat of change, or partner in a change, no ‘thing’ can ever play the part of cause.”¹ He rejects also the doctrine that a cause is simply another phenomenon in a series of events, and is a cause as occurring prior to the event called the effect. This, he says, would require that the maxim ‘cessante causa, cessat effectus’ be replaced by ‘cessante causa, *incipit* effectus.’ The effect would not appear till the agent ceased to exist. He accepts the idea that force is involved in cause, for causation is production not prophecy, but denies that they are identical. He says there are two questions here involved: “Whence any phenomenon at all out of the bosom of eternal rest? and, Whence this particular phenomenon?”² Power answers the first question adequately and is a nec-

¹ *Ibid.* p. 145.

² *Ibid.* p. 159.

essary part of the reply to the latter, but not the full reply. Why this particular phenomenon rather than any other? is a problem not resolved by power alone, but by power and the occasion for its use. This brings before us an agent in which the power resides. Power used for a purpose is causative. Dr. Martineau does not consider that simple intelligence apprehends the idea of cause, holds that the world processes would not suggest to the mere observant mind the causal relation. "Not till he throws himself into the field as agent can he find the problem and try to solve it. Its very rudiments spring from the activity of the ego." He then examines at some length the question, whether causality is an inference from perception, *i. e.*, whether we infer an external energy by which that known in perception is thrust upon us, and replies to it in the negative. Then follows the true doctrine, as the author understands it. In perception the self and the not-self appear opposed to each other, the monism of sensation passes into a dualism. The self apprehends a resisting force without and perceives immediately, *ab initio*, the outer world in relation to self; this relation is both dynamical and geometrical, it perceives that it has both a position without and has power to resist. Hence it perceives causal force. Now all we know of causal force is from immediate self-knowledge, "*through inner intuition*," and if we attribute causality to that without we must attribute it as known, and ascribe it to the outer world as we know it to be. But our causal force is will directed by a purpose, we are compelled therefore to see in the energy of the external world will directed by purpose. "Having thus possession of the antithesis—cause within and cause with-

out—the latter term becomes available thenceforward for changes within themselves. . . . True, the subjective focus has in it, as a seat of consciousness, an *immediate feeling* of operative will which can only be reflected on to the other [the non-ego.] But reflected it is, and must for ever be; for it is identified with the inmost essence of the sole causality accessible to us.”¹ Cause is therefore a disposing will, and when we see a change in nature, in the non-ego, we have to think of it as determined by a will in nature accordant with our personal will.²

The author considers himself entitled by his argument, briefly sketched above, to this conclusion: “That all which happens in nature has one kind of cause, and that cause a will like ours: and that the universe of originated things is the product of a supreme mind. And precisely thus, by no less immediate a step, are we carried, by the causal intuition, to the first truth of Religion.”³ Thus cause dynamically interpreted gives us our natural theism.

The author has an interesting chapter on the implicit attributes of God as Cause and sums up as follows: “There is One universal Cause, the infinite and eternal seat of all power, an omniscient Mind, ordering all things for ends selected with perfect wisdom.”

After treating of God as Cause the author treats of him as Perfection. He lays down as the basis of his argument the following: “It is the peculiarity of all properly moral verdicts, that they are not the expression of individual opinions which we work out for ourselves by sifting of evidence: but the enunciation of what is given us ready-made and has only to pass through us into speech.

¹ *Ibid.* p. 201.

² *Ibid.* pp. 208 and 213.

³ *Ibid.* p. 230.

. . . . The Moral Law is imposed by an authority foreign to our personality, and is open, not to be canvassed, but only to be obeyed or disobeyed."¹ He denies that conscience is a bundle of prudential maxims, argues with great acuteness that right is not established by social vote, and that it is the divine in the human. He holds that we can therefore rise to a knowledge of the divine through our moral nature. We find here a second method of establishing the first and fundamental truth of religion equally valid with that disclosed to us through our knowledge of the external world. "In the act of perception, we are immediately introduced to an *other than ourselves that gives us what we feel*: in the act of conscience we are immediately introduced to a *Higher than ourselves that gives us what we feel*: the externality in the one case, the authority in the other, the causality in both, are known upon exactly the same terms, and carry the same guarantee of their validity. . . . The dualism of perception, which sets us in the face of an objective world, and the dualism of conscience, which sets us in the face of an objective higher mind, are perfectly analogous in their ground."² He maintains that duty and law have no meaning except as they proceed from one who has authority over us and that we recognize him in recognizing them. "I care not whether this be called an *immediate vision* of God in the experiences of conscience, or whether it be taken as an *inference* drawn from the data they supply. . . . In any case the constitution of our moral nature is unintelligible, except as living in response to an objective perfection pervading

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 6 and 7.

² *Ibid.* pp. 28, 29.

the universe with holy law."¹ On this principle, we are entitled to say that conscience reveals the living God, because it finds neither content to its aspirations nor victory in its strife, till it touches his infinitude and goes forth from his embrace."²

The author designates as implicit attributes of God, as apprehended by conscience, *benevolence towards sentient beings, justice towards moral beings and amity towards like minds.* He also recognizes a united human life subject to the divine authority as constituting *a kingdom of God.* He argues briefly but convincingly "the unity of God as Cause and God as Perfection.

If one should ask, is religion worth cherishing? do we not in a few days, at most a few years, pass into non-existence, so that the existence and character of God are of little account? the work before us replies: the soul is immortal, religion is, therefore, important as well as real. The argument on this point is brief and not different from that found elsewhere. The author first shows that death, considered physiologically or metaphysically, does not require us to believe that the soul cannot exist separate from the body. He considers the moral argument the one which should control our belief. "Not till we turn to the moral aspects of death do we meet with the presiding reasons which give the casting vote. . . . From this position I now advance a further step and say that the divine ends manifestly inwrought in our human nature and life are continuous and of large reach; and, being here only partially or even incipiently attained, indicate that the present term of years is but a fragment

¹ *Ibid.* p. 30.

² *Ibid.* p. 37.

and a prelude."¹ Here he points out some of the vaticinations of our faculties and endeavors. He shows that the intellect is constituted for a larger range of knowledge than any now attained, that the conscience serves well the office of monitor, warns us clearly of what is to come, but utterly fails in inflicting punishment for sin. It even ceases to do its work when men become hardened in iniquity. There is also a vaticination in the suspense to which the judgment of the world is subject. Character can be justly estimated only after one has been long dead. Those who have been scourges of the race are at first honored as heroes, then execrated as monsters. If this is the fate of the best known of men, where, but in the world to come, will a just judgment be pronounced upon those who have lived lives of mostentious virtue or of secret crime?

We have presented simply the author's method of justifying our faith in the rock-basis of religion. We have not space to notice his method of confirming his own view by an extended essay on theodicy and another on determinism. His remarks on the permission of sin are not different from those frequently made on the subject, yet he seems to us to make less of sin than a true theology requires, and to have less of range for suppositions as to its permission than is open to those who hold to an objective atonement.

The author bends every energy to the proof of the freedom of the will. His entire scheme of thought depends on this. He knows God primarily as Will acting determinatively. But will in nature and over nature he

¹ *Ibid.* p. 367.

knows only as a will over against the subjective human will. The will known without is limited in its kinds of power to the will known within, for the knowledge of opposites is one. If, therefore, the human will is subject to necessity, is inevitably determined by motives, the divine will must be, at least can only be known as, so determined. His argument on this point is as clear as any to be found in our ordinary treatises, but does not cut off all reply. The difficulty on this subject still remains.

We cannot believe this work of Dr. Martineau will have any permanent influence upon the theological world though it will always repay careful reading. But so few people will admit that the idea of causation is derived solely from our own will action, and so few will admit that a will without is actually perceived in the perception of an external world, that the argument here can never have any great popular effect.

We notice with great gratification the author's view of teleology. He has not accepted the view that teleology, as held by Paley and others in former times, has been driven from the field, nor has he acceded to the boastings of recent evolutionists that while they have destroyed the old teleology they have established a new on an immovable basis. He reminds these new philosophers that they have made no new discovery but are merely annotators upon the works of their predecessors.

The Apologetic work of Professor Ebrard is now before the people of England and America, in their own language.¹ It is a work of great ability, evincing at once the

¹ *Apologetics, or the Scientific Vindication of Christianity.* By J. H. A. Ebrard, Ph.D. D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. 3 Vols. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark. 1886-1887.

acutest thinking and the broadest research. Still his bold assertions and somewhat haughty criticism tend to weaken one's confidence in the soundness of his judgment. His pronounced idealism will, with many, subject his views to suspicion. He takes his "departure" from this position : "There are indisputably existent to every man two facts : that he finds himself in a world given to him, which has been already existing before him, and as a part of the same, and that he is able to make this world the object of his cognition, while he in perceiving and cognizing, appropriates it, and consequently makes it the contents of himself."¹ He says again : "With all earnestness we must therefore firmly hold, that there is no matter, but only existing complexes of powers."² He says, we do not know that atoms, which are merely complexes of powers, are never lost, all we know is, that the laws by which they are combined and transformed exist. "The entire visible and audible and tangible nature is according to this—not perhaps, an illusive appearance—no, but a phenomenon of a kingdom of laws. A law, however, is nothing material, nothing corporeal, but something intellectual, because a something generally valid, embracing a plurality under a unity."³ Whatever may be thought of the author's philosophical position, there can be no question but the treatise before us is a very instructive one. His definition of apologetics shows at the outset that he is the advocate of positive ideas and has no intention, in treating of Christianity, of acting merely on the defensive. "Christian apologetics is distinguished from the mere apology by this, that it is not determined in course and method by the at-

¹ Vol. I., p. 25.² *Ibid.* p. 31.³ *Ibid.* p. 124.

tacks appearing casually at any point of time, but from the nature of Christianity itself deduces the method of the defence of the same, and consequently the defence itself. Apologetics is that science which deduces from the nature of Christianity itself what classes of attacks are generally possible, what different sides of Christian truth may possibly be assailed, and what false principles lie at the bottom of these attacks. Apologetics is the science of the defence of the truth of Christianity.”¹

The author conceives of Christianity not as a relative truth, but as eternal absolute truth; yet truth not in the form of doctrine but of realization. In its process of becoming, moving towards a full realization through redemption, it is connected with historic occurrences. Consequently attacks may be made upon it either by assailing its substantial content or its historic occurrences. The author accordingly divides his work into two parts; a defence of the eternal in Christianity, and a defence of its historic facts. The majority of readers will be interested specially in the first part. His method of procedure at this point we give in his own words. “The apologetics of Christianity in its first part, where it deals with the defence of the eternal truths of Christianity, has entirely to proceed solely from the general human facts of consciousness and from the certified results of the philosophy of nature, and has to ask whether the presuppositions of Christianity . . . agree with the facts of nature and of the natural consciousness or disagree therewith.”² The presuppositions of Christianity are: the existence of a holy God, of an ethical law, of human freedom and account-

¹ *Ibid.* p. 3.

² *Ibid.* p. 8.

ability, the fact of sin and man's inability to restore himself from the evils of sin. The author aims to establish these presuppositions by a course of positive argument, and then enters on an examination and refutation of opposing systems. In the second part of the treatise, having reference to the historical facts of Christianity, the author devotes more than 600 pages to an examination of the "Religions of Men," ranging from the ancient Aryan races to the North American Indians. He demonstrates the constant deterioration of all heathen religions, yet finds that all confirm the truth of the Bible narrative as far down as the account of the tower of Babel. He holds that the Semites were the most debased and hardened of all the races, and that the fact that Christ sprang from them is a demonstration that he came from God.. His treatment of this part of the theme may be inferred if we notice two questions which he discusses: "Is Jahayah a product of Israel? or is Israel a product of Jahayah, the living God?" and "why has God chosen one of the most corrupt of the races to prepare the way of redemption?"¹ After showing the futility of the religions of men he shows the validity of revelation as given us in the Scriptures and the validity of Christianity as seen in its effects.

We have now given but the barest outlines of this work which is one of vast labor,—the product of patient and protracted thought. We have not space to speak of the argumentations as they are conducted in the various sections of these volumes, but must refer readers to the volumes themselves. We think, however, that the author's peculiar treatment of the subject of design, his second sec-

¹ *Ibid.* p. 543.

tion in the examination of systems opposed to Christianity, designated "Teleophobe, or the Denial of the Presence of Design in Nature," is worthy of a fuller notice; teleology being a living subject in theological discussions.

He finds a purpose manifested everywhere in nature, not absolutely demonstrable in inorganic nature, still made probable, but in the organic world proved by indubitable evidence. "Now we find, then, that in each of these three stages [inorganic complex of powers, organism, animal-subject] the system of laws operates with reference to an end, that all nature is one great teleological system."¹ He begins the discussion by laying down the following thesis: "The laws of the inorganic world are ordered for the design of the making possible and of the subsistence of organic beings."² After referring to the laws of heat, the diffusion of gases, and the laws of light, he concludes: "Organic beings do not exist for the making possible the existence of the inorganic, but inorganic complexes of powers and their laws exist for the sake of organisms." But he contents himself finally with the following: "It suffices us for the present to establish that if the design, that organic life exist, is posited, the actually given laws of inorganic nature are throughout not, namely, contradictory, but corresponding to such a design."³

His second thesis is: "In single organic beings the laws of all elementary cells and individual organs are ordered for the design of the collective life of the organism." He notices that a plant begins life on the presupposition of its full development, constructs its own apparatus of organs and lays in supplies for organs not yet in existence. The

1 P. 163.

2 *Ibid.* p. 164.

3 *Ibid.* p. 168.

development of the individual is completed in the production of fruit or in "the germs of new, homogeneous, vegetable individuals." In this vital process the different systems of the plant, the different organs, are necessary to each other, if any should fail the whole would be injured. Here the author sees design completely demonstrated. While he did not in connection with the first thesis absolutely affirm design, he says: "It stands quite differently with our second teleological thesis. Here end and means do not lie beside and without one another, and do not allow themselves to be separated. . . . Here you cannot say: 'If it were the design of the plant to reproduce itself in flower and fruit, the vital process of the plant were for this purpose a suitable means,' but the plant is even in this self-reproduction really included; its existence and life is nothing else than self-reproduction. To assert: This self-reproduction in the seed (which nevertheless takes place with all plants) may be an accidental consequence of an accidental coincidence of external causes—this, candidly, would be insanity."¹ If the plant exhibits design, it cannot be in any one of the million cells which work towards a common end, but must be in a designer outside the plant. But the designing author cannot be the vital monad of the individual vegetable. This monad works unconsciously in directing the processes in the plant cells, and belongs to a single plant, while the design extends to all the plants of the species and of the genus. This brings the author to ask, who is the designing author of vegetable life? He establishes his second thesis still more fully by evidence derived from animal life. He says here too

¹ *Ibid.* p. 172.

it would be insanity to deny design and assert that the offices which the blood performs are undesigned accidental coincidences. He says also that a mechanical philosophy cannot explain the circulation of the blood. The power that carries the thirty pounds of blood through the arteries and veins is the nervous system. This nervous system is sustained by the blood, so the blood seems to be a *perpetuum mobile*, a small portion of the load, nourishing the nervous system carries the entire load much larger than itself,—mechanism does not explain this. Again, how are the galvanic currents, produced through the nerves, set free and checked,—regulated so as to produce the beating of the heart and effect the circulation? With the motor nerves this is indisputably the will, consequently a something incorporeal, and here the mechanical philosophy confesses its inability to disclose a mechanical explanation.¹ Thus he considers himself entitled to the inference that something incorporeal induces the nerve currents which cause the beating of the heart. This conclusion he thinks analogous to that asserting a designing author of the system. He finds another proof of design in the respiratory movements. These movements are called forth by the pneumo-gastric nerve, and upon the center of this nerve (the so-called *nœud vital*) there operates as a chief cause the want of oxygen in the blood. Here then is an incorporeal vital power working with design. “The thesis: ‘the want of oxygen excites the *nœud vital*’ is synonymous with the thesis: ‘the real non-presence of a substance which should be present for the attainment of the end, excites the *nœud vital*. And thus modern physiology

¹ *Ibid.* p. 182.

itself has furnished the most striking proof for teleology in the nature of the animal organism."¹ After pointing out other evidences of design in the animal organism, he asks again, whence comes the design? and replies as after the examination of vegetable life: "Neither the unconscious vital monad in the animal individual, nor the conscious and egoistical vital monad in the human individual, is the design-setting author of the animal and human organism."²

We pass over much that is of great interest and give in a brief quotation his view of the way of salvation: "Since, then, Christ's person has implanted me, the believer, as a member of himself, I become a part not only of Christ's person, but of all that is Christ's, hence above all of Christ's righteousness, that is, of all that Christ, without my participation, wrought and suffered. The holy and complete life in which he absolutely satisfied the moral law, and bore the suffering of absolute pain, which he guiltlessly endured as belonging to his person, is imputed to me with his person, is my real property, and so Christ's sufferings become a vicarious expiation, by means of which all guilt and even my own individual guilt is objectively and actually expiated."³

2. *Inspiration.*

It would be difficult to define the present attitude of theologians on the doctrine of inspiration. There can be little doubt that a great part of the members of the American Churches hold that the Scriptures are the infal-

¹ P. 184.

² P. 186.

³ P. 339.

lible rule of faith and practice. But among Christian students theories differ, ranging from verbal inspiration to an occasional gracious inspiration. Perhaps no one maintains the rigid mechanical theory, but some hold stoutly to a verbal theory, while others make inspiration simply the quality inferrible from the fact that the Bible produces wonderfully desirable effects.

We will notice two works which will show how far apart honest men may be on this important subject. The first is by Professor Manly of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.¹ The author states his view thus: "The Bible as a whole is the Word of God, so that in every part of Scripture there is both infallible truth and divine authority."² He does not attempt to present any theory of inspiration for it is the fact not the method of which we are assured in the Bible. His arguments in favor of the doctrine are those generally relied upon by orthodox theologians, but are presented with more than ordinary attention to logical sequence and with a fulness that makes each step in the argument easily apprehensible. There is one consideration which the author has made more than usually complete. "The re-appearance of the prophetic order is not only predicted by the Lord Jesus, but distinctly announced by Peter on the day of Pentecost as having actually occurred. And there was scarcely anything more startling in the incidents and announcements of the day of Pente-

¹ *The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration explained and vindicated*, by Basil Manly, D. D., LL. D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1888.

² P. 59.

cost than the impressive and astounding assurance that the gift of PROPHECY had been revived.”¹ The inspiration of the Old Testament is forcibly argued from the fact that the portrait of Christ is drawn by many hands in its various books and then folded up for four hundred years waiting for the original to appear. In the fulness of time he comes and is recognized by John the Baptist who says: “Behold the Lamb of God.” The man and the portrait agree.²

The other work is by Robert F. Horton, M. A., late Fellow of New College, Oxford.³ The author assumes the inspiration of the Bible and then attempts to find what inspiration is by the inductive process of investigation. He says: “We call our Bible inspired, by which we mean that by reading it and studying it we find our way to God, we find his will for us, and we find how we can conform ourselves to his will.”⁴ Making this the starting point we find what inspiration is by finding what the Bible is. The Bible is like no other book, this proves its inspiration. Its peculiar quality is its inspiration. Take this view of the subject and you have no more trouble. Let higher criticism do its worst, the Bible leads us to God and is inspired. Genesis has two inconsistent accounts of creation, two inconsistent accounts of the family of Cain, two inconsistent accounts of the flood, but it is inspired for it leads us to God. Some one may say, “I had supposed inspiration secured the Bible against incon-

¹ P. 127. ² P. 121.

³ *Inspiration and the Bible. An Inquiry.* London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1888.

⁴ P. 15.

sistencies, but this only shows what a mistaken idea of inspiration he had; one must get his idea of inspiration from the Bible, not bring it to the Bible. Cast-iron theories of inspiration are driving many into infidelity, but make inspiration to be just what the Bible is, and you have no trouble. The evil which, as the author conceives, rises from a preconceived theory on this subject, is thus vigorously set forth: “The whole of this polemical theology which has disgraced the Church of Christ and turned our attention aside from practical duty, so that the world remains unconverted, and educated Europe is smiling contemptuously upon us, may be traced to that radically false assumption, an assumption made from the beginning without any attempt at proof, that by an inspired New Testament must be meant a homogeneous treatise on theology which would authoritatively give us a doctrine and a church government divinely ordained and unquestionable, to which all must submit as to the Word of God.”¹

Lipsius notices in the *Jahresbericht* of 1887 a discourse by *Meuss* on inspiration, which admits the untenability of the old doctrine and finds the significance of the Scriptures in three things: they are the classic monuments of theistic piety, the gathered records pertaining to the kingdom of God, and the indispensable instrument of the Spirit in leading forward the Church. Lipsius, who is one of the liberals, expresses his perfect agreement with the author in the sentiment that “it is a great undervaluing of the Bible to find in it only a nomenclature of pure doctrine instead of finding in it above all things the living record of the historical revelation of God in Christ.”

3. Christology and the Trinity.

A. C. Armstrong & Son have published a new edition of Professor Bruce's Lectures on the Humiliation of Christ. The work, somewhat enlarged in the present edition, has been before the public for several years. The call for a new edition is its sufficient commendation. The theme is one of perennial interest, one always entering into the current discussions of theology. A topic at once so practical and so recondite must constantly awaken curiosity and give rise to innumerable questions. The diverse solutions of some of its problems show that the subject is not a settled one, and must at least raise the query, whether theologians ever can agree upon it.

The work of Professor Bruce is very instructive and brings before the reader much of speculation with which American pastors are not generally familiar. The chapter on "The Modern Kenotic Theories," and the Notes in the Appendix may be mentioned as having special interest.

*The Faith of the Gospel.*¹ a small volume of four hundred pages, seems to have been intended as a manual for theological students, but we call attention here mainly to its suggestions concerning the Trinity. It bears on almost every page the stamp of the author's private views and one needs to have some knowledge of theology before reading it. It does not assume to discuss thoroughly the several themes which belong to a body of divinity, but it presents such views on certain topics that it deserves notice as a book which may have an influence upon popular

¹ *The Faith of the Gospel.* A Manual of Christian Doctrine. By Arthur James Mason, B. D. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co. 1888.

thought. Notably the estimate of the metaphysical proofs of the Trinity of the Godhead here presented deserves attention; the conception of the tri-personality seems to us more happy than that ordinarily found in like treatises. Theologians have not generally adhered to the Scripture statements on this point so closely as they might have done with advantage. Our author has not done this perfectly, but has surpassed many of his predecessors. For our thinking, whatever is, whatever can be called *thing*, has an inside and an outside; or there is an inner truth and an outer expression. The human soul has an expression. It manifests itself through the body; not that the body is its expression, but there is a *look* impressed on the body, on the countenance, which is the soul's manifestation of itself. The Bible more than suggests the fact that God manifests himself or makes himself known by an expression. God and his glory are two ideas and yet one. The glory of God is as sacred as God himself, he is known to us only by his glory, if that were hidden he would be hidden. It would be very difficult to tell what God's glory is: it is not the material world as dead matter, but the looks which the world wears. Whether his *sign manual*, his *name*, be fire or wind, force or law, it would be difficult to say, but it is something that appears to us, and, when we see it, we see God in it. But the ultimate glory of God, its original and eternal manifestation is his Son. He is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person. We have the Scripture warrant for so believing, and may be permitted to accept the statement in its simplicity as a literal truth. This image of God is the Logos which was in

the beginning, was with God, and was God. It is probably impossible for us to see that this Logos, express image, is a distinct person, but it is also impossible to deny it. And we have full warrant in the Bible for attributing personality to it. Nor are we wholly unable to illustrate the distinct personality of the Father and the Son. In man there is an antithesis between the soul and the animated body which suggests a two-fold personality. These are the inner and the outer man. And though there is here really but one *ego*, we can readily recognize the powers contending for the possession of the ego. In the Deity there is no reason for apprehending a warring for the possession of the *ego*, but there is no ground for denying that the Logos and He, with whom the Logos is, may each be possessed of such attributes that personality may be predicated of each. Such a mode of divine existence coincides with human knowledge as fully as any other. A two-fold personality would not be known *a priori*, but we have no reason to deny it, while a two-foldness of existence—an outer and inner, a being and an expression,—is absolutely necessary in anything which is an object of human knowledge.

This seems to be the primary view of the author concerning the Father and the Son, except that he would perhaps say we can have an *a priori* apprehension of the two-fold personality. But we do not think that his statements on this point clear up any difficulty. He considers that God could not perceive himself if he were in utter solitude, and that there must therefore be another who is yet the same in order that he may know himself. But this seems to us an unwarranted transfer of our *method* of knowledge

to God. He thinks, also, God could not love with the noblest and purest emotion if he did not love another than himself, yet one as good as himself. "It can only be morally true to say that God loves himself, if there be eternally within the divine nature a real distinction of persons, whereby one Divine Person may lavish the infinite wealth of his love upon another Divine Person, who is infinitely worthy of receiving it."¹ This again seems to us interpreting God's love by human love,—and possibly not by human love in its highest form.

It is easier to illustrate to one's own mind a duplicate personality in the Deity than the tri-personality, but the thought of the tri-personality is as legitimate and has as good ground in the Scriptures, perhaps as good in reason. If we admit the personality of the expression, the Logos, as well as that of the thing expressed, then we must suppose also a mutual recognition of each person by the other. There must go forth from each a knowledge that "searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." This knowledge of each person proceeds from each but is the same knowledge, it supposes the duality of persons, is conditioned on it, but is not a distinct quality of either; if therefore we may hypostasize this knowledge, considering it the knowledge of the Divine Spirit, but not of the Father or Son alone we have a third person of the Trinity—this is the Holy Spirit. Our author expresses his conception of the matter in this way: "We shall expect to find the movement whereby God places himself before himself, followed up by a movement whereby he makes himself fully known, in all his loveableness and wisdom, to the

¹ P. 42.

object thus set before him, and receives back the response of that object. And we may perhaps dimly apprehend how this mediation between the Divine "I" and "Thou" should itself be fitly the work of a person. . . . It seems to put the completing touch to the glory of the Divine life when we see Person and Person eternally made known to each other, in their difference and in their unity, by a Person to whom both are absolutely known, and who is absolutely one with both."¹ We should prefer to make the knowledge the indication of the person rather than the person the condition of the knowledge, but we think by giving an objective reality to truths clearly stated in the Bible, and by separating the idea of personality from some of its human associations, we may attain an idea of the Trinity which is not contradictory to the ultimate conceptions of science and philosophy.

It might very easily be asked, why each person of the Trinity should not repeat the process of objectification and hypostasizing, so that we should have nine divine persons instead of three, and why the process should not continue indefinitely; but we think a reply would be easy, though we shall not enter upon the discussion of it. Both ethical and metaphysical arguments would lead us to rest in the tri-personality.

We pass other points, except to notice that our author is, for a Protestant, (perhaps he would not permit himself to be called a Protestant) a high sacramentarian. He finds something sacramental in preaching and in marriage. But what we wish to notice for a moment is his view of regeneration by the sacrament of baptism. He says:

“We need religion, because we are fallen ; but regeneration places us on a higher level than that of our unfallen innocence. Adam in Paradise had no such glory as is made ours in baptism. The incarnation of the Son of God has done more for us than the taking away of our sins. . . . It is in baptism that we are made so [Gods, as Christ was made man], through incorporation into the sacred humanity of Christ.”¹ This regeneration which “is a metaphysical change, altering a man’s nature,”² may be destroyed out of the soul. It is imparted to infants when they are baptized, may be thrust upon an adult for a moment, but may be repelled if one chooses. It is conversion not regeneration that determines as to one’s salvation. Conversion may begin before or after regeneration. In any case it will save the soul and be crowned with regeneration in the next world if not in this. Regeneration without conversion will avail nothing.³

4. *The Atonement.*

The work on *Soteriology*⁴ by Professor S. G. Burney is, in substance, the lectures given for many years to classes of theological students. The work evinces patient study, love of the theme and much dialectical skill. But it is repetitious, polemic, and, as it seems to us, feeble in its support of the theory adopted. The author never tires of pointing out the weakness and contradictions of the

¹ P. 272. ² P. 343. ³ P. 342.

⁴ *Atonement. Soteriology.* The Saerificial, in contrast with the Penal, Substitutional, and merely Moral or Exemplary Theories of Propitiation. S. G. Burney, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Cumberland University. Nashville, Tenn., 1888.

penal and substitutionary theories of the atonement as he understands them. Imputation of sin or of righteousness he considers an absurdity ; Christ had, in his view, no righteousness to impute, none but that of his own personal character ; suffering a penalty cannot possibly have any connection with granting a pardon ; and the suffering of a substitute cannot possibly relieve a principal from suffering for his guilt.

The author does not adopt the moral influence theory of the atonement. He holds that the divine mind is affected by an atonement, and instanceing those made by Moses, Aaron, Phineas, he says : “ To say that these had no influence upon the divine mind would be to say that the Bible is a book of shams, rather than of realities.”¹ The sacrificial death of Christ, though different from other atonements, like them in some way effects a propitiation, so that God can be merciful without being unjust. The exercise of mercy is the pardon of sin and the removal of it, not deliverance from punishment. We are delivered by being made holy, not by a forensic decision of the Judge.

The author makes much of the holiness of the mediator between God and man. Under the old dispensation only appointed priests could secure favor for the guilty, and under the new dispensation men are pardoned only because a holy Saviour gives them repentance. If a sinful man could repent, it would be of no avail, for God cannot under any circumstances accept that which an unholy being performs.

The author makes much also of the resurrection of

¹ P. 308.

Christ. He was raised for our justification. Our salvation is his present work upon us. He makes us like himself, imparts, not imputes, his character to us, and in that way we are saved by his righteousness, by its becoming our own personal character. “I ought to be profoundly grateful to the blessed, loving Christ, not for doing what he did not do, nor for doing what he could not do, nor for doing what, if done, would be the greatest of all calamities to me, but for obeying the law in his own place—even unto death, and being raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, and thus made a quickening spirit, who can impart to me his own death unto sin and life unto God, and thus enable me to love God and my neighbor as myself.”¹

The book of Dr. Cochran is a work of patient labor and careful thought.² The author has given us in a closely printed volume of more than five hundred pages, the result of twenty or more years of study. The treatise consists of four parts; the first part presents the author’s view of the moral system; the second presents his view of theism, so far as the doctrine of redemption makes it necessary; the third treats of the atonement proper; the fourth gives us the Scripture teaching on this subject. The twenty-four chapters, made up of two hundred and ninety-five numbered sections, are so woven together that no mere notice can give an adequate idea of the work. The comprehensive thought that binds all the parts into one whole makes it impossible to represent the work by means of specimen

¹ P. 328.

² *The Moral System and the Atonement.* By Rev. Samuel Davies Cochran, D.D. Oberlin, Ohio: Edward J. Goodrich. 1889.

quotations, it is only by a careful study of the book that one will master the scheme which it contains. We shall attempt nothing more in the present notice than a statement of the author's views on some important points without regard to their connection with the main topic or with each other.

A principle on which he dwells with emphasis and to which he frequently recurs may be stated as the *realism* of law. "The law is *concrete and social*. By *concrete* is meant that it is never given as an abstraction. . . . By *social* is meant, in addition, that its matter of moral love is enjoined by its imperative as owed by and due from its subject to objects. . . . The whole rational universe is thus interbound into one society, with God as its center and head."¹ It is from this social character of law that he infers the need of retribution and atonement, as will be noticed hereafter. One of Dr. Cochran's sharpest criticisms of Dr. Bushnell (and there are not a few of them) relates to this point. "A more fantastic notion has never been invented than that of a law *before* government, *impersonal*, and having only the natural consequences of obedience or disobedience to it for retributions." He then notices Dr. B's view of law as being *the idea of right* and adds: "He calls this imagined law *impersonal!* As well talk of thought without a thinker, a creature without a creator, or an effect without a cause; for what conception of law remains, if it is not an authoritative rule of moral action, declared and administered by an authoritative person?"²

In connection with this view of law, really as an infer-

¹ P. 5.

² P. 9.

ence from it (God being under the law), the author holds that God does all he can for the happiness of the human race. “The answer to all questions concerning this matter [God’s obligation to furnish an atonement] lies in this nutshell—He is a moral being; and, if so, is necessarily under the obligations of the eternal, immutable moral law in and from his moral reason in all his actions towards his moral creatures to do the greatest good possible.”¹ “God’s design in constituting them [moral beings] was not that they should sin and suffer either the natural or the retributory consequences of so doing, but it was that they should obey his law and experience the blessed consequences, both natural and remuneratory, of so doing; and he has done all he could, consistently with their nature and relations, to keep them from doing and suffering the former, and to induce them to do and experience the latter.”² Hence he holds that there was the strongest antecedent probability of an atonement before it was disclosed, a moral certainty that God would do his utmost to save men from ruin. This presumption he considers to be now the basis of the strongest argument against infidelity.³

Our author makes frequent use of the expression moral love. He has in mind that love which is the fulfilling of the law and which, as he holds, is the sum of virtue. He discards the utilitarian theory of virtue and says of this love: “It is *voluntary and designed*, and consists in freely *willing or choosing* the good of its objects for their sakes. It is unselfish, disinterested, embraces all righteousness, and because it is *just*, it is impartial, and in principle, universal.”⁴ A love which is merely sentimental, which

¹ P. 315.

² P. 81.

³ P. 149.

⁴ P. 108.

discards retribution, would, in his opinion, engulf the world in woe, would in the end give rise to lamentations and satires "over the race sunk and festering in inexpressible corruptions and horrors of inhumanity, beastliness, villainies, crimes and anarchies, raving and raging with deviltries and dynamite."¹

One of the sentiments most positively insisted upon as essential in a moral system is that of retribution. The author rejects decisively the idea that the natural consequences of sin are the punishment of sin. His view of the social nature of the moral system forbids this. Self-approval is not the reward of right conduct, self-condemnation is not the punishment of wrong doing, but the inflictions of the divine Ruler are the punishments of disobedience to his law, and it is these sanctions of vindictory justice which man instinctively looks forward to, which his conscience "presignifies" in its condemnation of sin. The natural consequences of sin cannot be retributive since they are merely personal and have no relation to the social system, and no return to those who have been defrauded of the love which was their due. He uses the strongest language in setting forth the character of the divine retribution. He maintains that God "must make the punitive retributions of sin exactly equal in every case to the actual measure of ill-desert. . . . If God had not connected and would not administer all its (the law's) sanctions, as both conscience and the Bible announce them, he would not even approach doing all he could and ought to do to prevent sin with all its due progeny of natural and social consequences."² "The measure of inflicted suf-

¹ P. 298.

² P. 75.

fering must be in every case neither less nor more than exactly just."¹

When the question rises whether the demands of exact justice can in any way be set aside, the reply is, guilt may be of such a quality that the law is not in absolute antagonism to the sinner. He may be a transgressor of the law and so justly condemned, yet there may be personal qualities which excite pity and bring into exercise the sentiment of mercy. In such a case it is proper to ask whether a substitute for the punishment may be found. The law divides itself into two parts, one requiring justice, the other requiring benevolence in the form of mercy. "It is only respecting sinners, in whose cases there are *mitigating circumstances*, such as great want of light and experience, circumvention and great temptation by superior wicked minds, . . . that the antagonism of the law's justice to them is not absolute, but modified, and that redemption is possible."² The demand of mercy is not that justice be set aside, but that those whose sin is instigated be rescued from destruction if it can be done consistently with justice. Mercy is only a remainder of love towards sinners which is consistent with retributive justice.³ "The demand for primitive retributive justice upon sinners is always and necessarily antecedent to, and the occasion of, the dictate to exercise mercy."

He holds it as a fundamental fact, and one abundantly asserted in the Bible, that God will maintain his holiness, his character for justice. The exercise of mercy therefore depends on the possibility of satisfying the still remaining demands of justice. The claim of jus-

¹ P. 85.

² P. 220.

³ P. 223.

⁴ P. 227.

tice precedes. "It is this fact that made expiation a *conditio sine qua non* of the forgiveness of sinners."¹

Expiation he makes to be satisfaction for wrong-doing "by some equivalent of repairing action, sacrifice, or sufferance of penalty." Such an expiation is attempted in the incarnation and death of Christ. "What we affirm is not that Christ was *punished* for the guilty, which was not possible, but that he voluntarily, having from infinite philanthropy become their representative with the Father as Ruler, acted the consummate self-denial and self-sacrifice of equivalently *suffering their punishment* in their stead, which he had an absolute right to do, as no sane man of respectable intelligence can deny, and that he did this in agreement with the Father, who had the same right to act the self-denial and self-sacrifice he did in his part of the amazing transaction."² This suffering was an expiation for the sins of many, potentially for all, actually for all those who should comply with the conditions on which it may be made available. And it is not only an expiation, it is also a propitiation, because justice is vindicated by it and there is no longer a bar to the exercise of mercy. As expiatory and propitiatory the sacrifice of Christ constitutes an atonement. Whether the atonement is sufficient is to be answered not by men; we must ask, "How did the Father, to whom as universal Ruler the atonement was made by them (the sufferings of Christ), and in whom it was to have its sole effect regard it? This is really the only important question for us concerning it, and the delightful answer is, *with infinite satisfaction*."³ Dr. Cochran holds that God's relations to his moral subjects is such,

¹ P. 238.

² P. 290.

³ P. 268.

and the demands of justice are such, that no other than a real vicarious atonement — substitutionary suffering — could have availed for the salvation of sinners. He holds that men underwent their legal probation in Adam but are allowed a gracious probation because of the atonement. He holds to the traducian theory of race propagation and inherited depravity, but holds to an election to salvation because of foreseen good works. God saw that many of the race would be salvable if an atonement were provided, he therefore provided the atonement and elected those whom he saw he could induce to accept it.

In this brief sketch we have brought forward a few of the important points discussed by a thinker who shows himself to be possessed of both acuteness and systematizing power.

5. *Eschatology.*

*Is there Salvation after Death?*¹ This is an able and thorough work upon the most exciting theological question of the day. The author shows his skill as a dialectician in his statement of the question and in his statement of the conclusion. He insists that the advocates of a *post mortem* probation shall accept all that their argument requires in order to be conclusive; for example, if the doctrine is proved from the two assumptions, that probation consists in a decision concerning the historic Christ, and that all men are subjected to this probation, then he insists that the doctrine is not to be set aside as a mere hypothe-

¹ *Is there salvation after death?* A Treatise on the Gospel in the Intermediate State. By E. D. Morris, D. D., LL. D. Lane Theological Seminary. A. C. Armstrong & Son. New York.

sis. However self-contradictory some persons may allow themselves to be, the system of thought contains the assertion that the future life is the period specially appointed for man's probation. The author also recognizes the fact that, on a question like this, neither side can be absolutely compelled to give over the discussion, but that all that is to be required of the opponents of the doctrine is to show that there is no adequate ground for believing it. In arguing the question he examines the Scripture passages relating to the subject, then takes into consideration the bearing of Christian symbolism, Christian theology and Christian experience upon his theme. He thinks himself entitled, after a careful examination of the various texts of the Bible usually cited in this connection, to the conclusion, that the word of God in no clear way suggests the dogma of salvation after death; that "its general as well as particular teaching" is "in irreconcilable conflict" with it.

The argument in favor of future probation derived from the headship of Christ the author considers null because Christ is the head, not of humanity at large, but of redeemed humanity. This view he considers corroborated by that of the late Professor H. B. Smith. From an examination of the symbols of the Church he concludes, "that the attempt to introduce this dogma into the accepted creeds of Christendom would require not only a reconstruction of these creeds at many vital points, but in fact an abandonment or extensive modification of some of their most essential doctrines,—a new theology thus growing into confessional form, not by the development and expansion of preceding confessions, but on their ruins, or

through such revolutionary transmutations as would leave but little else than the fragments of the old faith.”¹

The author’s treatment of the argument from consciousness is specially satisfactory. Much has been made of late of the ethico-religious consciousness as a ground of belief; but Professor Morris shows that the natural consciousness is not to be entrusted with the decision of human destiny, that the consciousness of the regenerate man can never embolden him to hold a doctrine that is anti-biblical, and that in any case the consciousness of a few cannot be allowed to prevail over the “ecumenical consciousness of the Church.”

There is one view of the divine work in salvation here presented which we have not noticed elsewhere; it is this, that the work of the Holy Spirit is temporal only. After noticing the means by which the Spirit works as favoring this view the author says: “But waiving these queries, and contemplating the Holy Spirit alone, we are confronted by this decisive fact, that nowhere in the Bible is there a verse, a line, a phrase, which teaches that the Spirit has any mission or office or agency which reaches beyond the boundaries of time.”² We cannot say that we consider the Professor’s position strengthened by this argument.

The treatment of the subject of probation in the book before us is admirable. The doctrine that human probation closed with the fall of Adam is avoided, the position that each man has a fair chance to obey the law by which he is to be judged is maintained, and the grace manifested in permitting a Christian judgment to be applied to those who have lived under the law simply is fairly set forth.

¹ P. 154.

² P. 105.

6. *Church Polity.*

*The Church-Kingdom.*¹ This work presents to us an extended survey of church polity. It consists of twelve lectures published in an octavo volume of more than 370 pages. The author has long been known as a leader in this department of Christian doctrine. He is a theorizer and desires to bring our Congregational polity to what he would consider a complete and consistent form. It will be admitted by all, those who may differ from him as well as those who agree, that he has adjusted his scheme with much thought and care.

He finds that all church polities may be reduced to four: Papacy, Episcopacy, Presbyterianism and Congregationalism. He considers that the last is the only one through which the true idea of the Church can be fully realized. Whatever service may have been done by the others, or may yet be done, they must finally fail. He says: "On the principle, too, of development, which we have more than once referred to, the Congregational theory will possess the field. It comes latest as the consummate flower of all. True, it is not strictly developed out of any theory or theories; for it was the plan of the apostles to establish a great number of distinct, independent churches; but the principle there announced and embodied was buried up for more than a millennium by adverse theories. . . . The other theories are undergoing testing by the Word and by the providence of

¹ *The Church-Kingdom: Lectures on Congregationalism*, delivered on the Southworth Foundation in the Andover Theological Seminary. By A. Hastings Ross. Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday School and Publishing Society. 1887.

God. They fail to express the brotherhood of the saints in its fulness of liberty. Hence they must cease. This expresses brotherhood, and hence makes all in the local church equal, and issues in popular government and liberty. It is able to exhibit the unity of the church-kingdom on principles of fellowship and coöperation, and so to fulfill the prayer of the Master that all may be one, that the world may believe on him. Thus the glorious end is reached on the plan of the apostles.”¹

The dominant idea in the work before us is the Church-Kingdom. This is an invisible organization of which Christ is Head and King. It is composed of those who are redeemed, who are the true followers of Christ. This body of believers viewed in relation to one another is the Church, viewed in relation to Christ is the Kingdom. All local churches are manifestations of this kingdom, but taken together as visible on earth do not constitute it. “The kingdom of heaven is partly on earth and partly in heaven, and is constantly coming.”² “We must broaden our conception of local churches into an ecumenical comprehension if we would attain an adequate idea of the kingdom of heaven in manifestation. . . . But in this manifestation of the kingdom we must not for a moment forget that the local church is the great factor. . . . It is in and through local churches that the kingdom becomes the light of the world and the salt of the earth.”³

The underlying kingdom is the force which gives to the manifestations of the Church their form and vitality. The ministry is the direct product of the kingdom. As Christ

¹ P. 130.

² P. 29.

³ P. 38.

chose his apostles who gathered churches so he now appoints some to be ministers who shall found and serve local churches. The local churches are the product of the ministry, not the ministry of the churches. The author therefore rejects the pastoral theory of the ministry and maintains that the Church must call for its pastor one already a minister. There is indeed no power save the Head of the Church competent to put one into the ministry. He holds that the minister is responsible to the churches to some extent but is not under their control in the discharge of his ministerial office. "It is only when the churches forbid him to fulfill his divine calling that he can rightly assert his higher commission."¹ "The recognition of the ministry is made in ordination, which is a formal inquiry and setting apart to the work." "Ordination is the ecclesiastical recognition of the ministerial function of the Church-Kingdom as that function appears in individuals called by Jesus Christ to preach the Word. It is not therefore primarily and fundamentally an inauguration into the pastoral office, as the New England fathers made it, but into the ministry of the Word."²

Ordination is to be performed by the churches. The power of the keys has been permanently committed to them. They can try the spirits and detect false teachers. Congregationalism knows no priestly or clerical rule; it is not therefore for the ministry to ordain, while this function may be discharged by even a single church. The churches may properly ordain by councils, but the author thinks it would be well if associated churches would assume the responsibility and discharge the duty of this

¹ P. 156.² P. 150.

office. Ordination confers no peculiar right or authority, so that one may preach without it, may preach if it is refused him, may claim and exercise the ministerial office if the churches deny it to him. In that case, however, he must find his own flock and no Christian body is in any way responsible for him.

One of the most interesting and important questions brought before us in this book is that of ministerial standing. The author has given it much thought and in his own mind has come very clearly to the conclusion that it should be in church associations. He would have these associations ordain, try, defend, depose, endorse the ministers belonging to them as each should deserve or desire, and would have no other recognized depositary of ministerial standing; each minister having the right of appeal from the association to a council. He finds objection to having the ministerial standing in a civil organization, in a local church, in a council, in unassociated churches, in ministerial associations, and thinks an association of churches the only body to which it can properly belong. The extreme view of Independency, that one is a minister only as he is a pastor of a local church it has been found impossible to maintain, since it would exclude from the ministry College Presidents, Professors, Secretaries and many others who are constantly relied upon for important ministerial labor. It is a question for Congregationalists to answer, where shall a retired preacher find his warrant for calling himself a minister of the gospel?

Dr. Ross favors a plurality of elders in our churches, especially the large churches, and finds no warrant for

considering an elder a layman. A ruling elder of a different order from a teaching elder is to him a myth.

It is worthy of remark that the historical sketches to be found in this work of Dr. Ross add much to its interest and value.

III. ETHICS.

Die Wahlfreiheit des Willens in ihrer Nichtigkeit dargestellt, von Waldemar Meyer, Pastor, a little work of 218 pages published at Gotha in 1886, is remarkably like discussions on the will published in this country in the early part of this century. The author's aim is to show that there is no such thing as free-choice, by which he means choice apart from motives. The liberty which he opposes is the liberty of indifference. He defines the will to be the proper expression of the *ego*, so that a choice without a motive would be an expression without expressing anything, or motive and freedom are contradictory opposites. In each particular act of will we have, as he holds, an indication of that which is now uppermost in the spirit-life of the willing subject, while the sum of all the will decisions is the best possible mirror of the inner state of the willing subject. Real freedom, the author teaches, is the will being controlled by the sweet necessity of the good; and this, so far from being the destruction of moral character, is the very highest stage of morality.

This treatise is, in its philosophy, an exact reproduction of the *Taste Scheme* of Dr. Asa Burton. In richness of thought and calm, steady eloquence of statement, however, it falls far below the essays of the famous Vermont divine. Pastor Meyer, like his American predecessor,

holds firmly to the responsibility of the individual, not because he is possessed of the freedom of indifference, but because he has no such freedom. Both teach that moral character precedes acts of will and cannot possibly be generated by them. The German theologian appends to his discussion of freedom an essay on man's responsibility for sin. He holds most firmly to this responsibility, considers it proved by the consciousness of guilt, but confesses that it cannot be explained. He says that the possibility of sin is inexplicable, and that only by a recognition of this fact can we maintain the true doctrine of sin and man's full responsibility for his sin.

Hegel's Philosophy of the State and of History,¹ by Professor G. S. Morris, is a volume of 306 pages belonging to Griggs' Philosophical Classics. It is a difficult thing to interpret Hegel to the American mind. He has been much studied in the English Universities, but his thoughts do not seem to have become familiar to the mass of English students. It is well known also that there are different interpretations of his philosophy in the land of his birth. We believe Professor Morris is as likely to be a successful expounder of his system of thought as any one in this country; his former volume in this series, that upon Kant, showed that he had formed a clear estimate of Kant's excellencies and deficiencies and knew well where the Königsberg Philosopher needed to be supplemented by Hegel, and we trust he will not commit it to other

¹ *Hegel's Philosophy of the State and of History*. An Exposition by George S. Morris. Professor of Philosophy in the University of Michigan. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Company, 1887.

hands to prepare an interpretation of Hegel's more strictly metaphysical works.

The work now before us may be warmly commended for its general view of morals, even if its sentiments concerning the State and History should not be accepted. It treats man as ethical in himself and looks upon his life as a realization of morals. It assumes that all of social life is an embodiment of the ethical, so that law, government, economics, social habits, culture of taste, are simply branches of an ethical system necessarily wrought out in human life. Recent treatises on morals in this country have, as it seems to us, begun at the wrong end of the subject. Theoretical morals, systematized by means of the law of conscience, can only present a scheme of duties as a guide of conduct, do not bring to view the nature and the life in which essential morals reside. Some authors even deny that bad morals are morals at all, so absorbed are they in discriminating between abstractions while they should be treating of realities. Hegel's view of morals as the evolution of the moral within man, instead of being simply obedience to, or transgression of, law, may be seen in the following : "He who first employs aggressive violence against another's freedom wars, not only against his neighbor, but against himself. His act is thus inherently, or in conception, self-contradictory and self-destructive ; it is in accordance with its own nature that it should defeat itself and come to naught."¹ Hegel's idea of the State was brought before the American people some years ago by a treatise on *The Nation* by the late Elisha Mulford, LL. D.; at least the author acknowledged his great in-

debtiness to Hegel. Professor Morris has presented the idea much more succinctly, aiming simply to be an interpreter of the German philosopher. According to this view the State may be said to be a person. As the family is a unit, so the State is a larger unit, and only in it does the individual man find his real self. He is for the State and reaches the fullness of his capacity as a man only through it. "The State, we have said, is the actualization of the Idea of Man; that it is not simply a contingent means of human perfection, but *is* also this perfection."¹

There would be little objection to such a view of the State if one might understand the language literally or figuratively as should suit his own ideas. But when the State is made a universal spirit and is in its inner substance an unseen State, one is inclined to question and ask for more definite statements. If the individual feels that as a citizen he devotes himself to the universal, and becomes free by losing himself through a union with *a* universal spirit, or *the* universal spirit, then he must feel himself overruled, if not absorbed, by a power outside himself. One is inclined to ask, is this power personal or impersonal? It is not strange that Hegelianism should by some be thought to border closely on pantheism.

The same sentiment rises again when one considers Hegel's view of the Church. He seems to have looked upon the Church and the State as essentially one, an organization in which religion as well as citizenship realizes its ideas. Man is free by becoming self-consciously partaker of the universal spirit and in this is at once a man of God and a man of the State.

¹ P. 84.

Hegel's view of the philosophy of history as presented by Prof. Morris is entertaining and instructive. No one can object to Hegel's sentiments so long as he occupies himself with showing that "the goal of history is resemblance to God," but it is difficult to believe that he does not select facts to establish a theory rather than evolve a theory from facts. When he attempts to bring Christianity into the range of events evolved from the progress of humanity he seems to us to make too little of miracles and interpositions of Deity, and too little of sin and regeneration. He finds that mankind was prepared for Christianity in the Roman world, but it became effective in the Germanic world. But the Germanic world has not wrought out "the healing of the nations," the cure of souls has, as yet, been an individual work, and, as is generally believed, effected by the direct work of the Holy Spirit, not through a historic national development.*

The work of Dr. Fairbairn¹ is a plea for a fuller system of religious morals than is now to be found in any of our publications on this subject. The author thinks that at a time when members of our churches become defaulters and many persons go from high positions in religious

¹ *Of the Doctrine of Morality in its Relation to the Grace of Redemption*. By Robert B. Fairbairn, D. D., LL.D., Warden of St. Stephen's College, Armandale, N. Y. New York: Thomas Whitaker. 1887.

* NOTE.—Since the above was written the cause of philosophy and of education has been called to mourn the untimely death of Professor Morris. He had made himself a teacher in certain departments of thought, and his friends were justified in expecting from him eminent service to metaphysical science.

organizations to state-prisons, there should be some attention given the instruction of the young in the full range of Christian duties. We like his use of the word morals rather than ethics, and wish he had written the book for which he calls instead of attempting to show that such a work is possible. His desire is that a work should be prepared which should give in addition to the morals which become practical in a state of nature those which become practical through the grace of God in redemption. He thinks the scheme a feasible one. In opposition to some Christian writers he teaches that natural morals form a system, and that the system is consistent with itself, so that vice is never taken for virtue. Nature favors morality. Sin rises from an unbalanced nature. Sin never makes its way into the realm of the theoretical virtues, it cannot vitiate the system of duties made binding by the constitution of man. Christianity therefore adopts the morality of nature and gives power to realize it in life. It gives no new principles, but "enables the soul to perform just the actions which were intended by the Creator." These actions, demanded by nature, made possible by Christianity, should be delineated and inculcated as the true scheme of morals. "There is necessity for a moral theology in the Church, just as there is for a system of dogmatic theology." The creed instructs us in revealed doctrines, the commandments in social duties. The exposition of one gives us a system of dogmas, the exposition of the other a system of morals. "A book on moral theology would show the relation of grace, of the divine power from God, to each state and condition of life, and it would teach the bearing of that grace on the cultivation

of every virtue, and its bearing on the aid required to resist sin."¹ The work before us is a treatise on morals as well as a plea for a systematizing of morality; in pointing out the aim of the work we bring to view but a small portion of its value. The remarks on conscience and on the virtues as inculcated in various moral systems have impressed us as having more than ordinary interest.

*Philosophy and Religion.*² This work by Professor Strong of Rochester Theological Seminary consists of essays, addresses and sermons—fifty in all—prepared from time to time during the last twenty-two years, now collected and published in a single volume. They relate to important topics and are all written with care. The author's treatise on systematic theology was noticed in *Current Discussions* last year. The present volume has little that requires additional comment. We find here the same evidence of extensive reading and practical thought that the former volume presented. In a few instances his views seem to be here disclosed a little more unguardedly than in the previous work. One article on the will is entitled "An Earlier View of the Will," and is followed by an article on the "Remainders of Freedom in Man." The former is a statement of the doctrine of determinism; the latter betrays a dissatisfaction with that theory but really does not avoid it; it simply brings to view a larger array of determining forces by which the will is controlled. The author traces the new departure

¹ P. 323.

² *Philosophy and Religion*, by Augustus Hopkins Strong, D. D., President and Professor in the Rochester Theological Seminary, New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1888.

in theology, *i. e.*, the doctrine of future probation to the new theology of Hopkins and other New England divines. He thinks it clear that man has no fair probation in this life, unless he had it in Adam. If this is denied, probation in another life must be granted. It would be much easier and much more correct to attribute the new departure to a reaction from his own view of race sin and individual guilt incurred in the Garden of Eden. We may call attention to the paper on *Materialistic Skepticism* as an instance of vigorous reasoning and to that on *Poetry and Robert Browning* as evidence of the author's broad range of culture.

The intimate connection between philosophy and theology entitles the work of Professor Stuckenbergs to a brief notice in *Current Discussions*.¹ Its aim is to give the student of philosophy his first landing place, a position from which he can survey the field of his future labors. It is intended to open to him the way which shall lead to a reply to this question: "With the knowledge that exists, what do the laws of thought teach us respecting the world, the soul, and God?"² Almost every page evinces the author's love of his theme and familiarity with the topics with which he deals. He lays before the reader the relation of philosophy to religion, to natural science and to psychology. Philosophy he considers divisible into four departments: Theory of Knowledge (Noetics), Metaphysics, Aesthetics and Ethics. He closes the work with a chapter on "The Spirit and the Method

¹ *Introduction to the Study of Philosophy*, by J. H. W. Stuckenbergs, D. D. New York : A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1888.

² P. 262.

in the Study of Philosophy,"—a chapter replete with valuable suggestions. The author's competency to his work will be apparent if we notice a few brief and clear statements and definitions selected almost at random from his pages. As instances the following may be cited: "The real of the senses is not the limit of the real of the reason."¹ He quotes from Paulsen thus: "He is a philosopher whose inquiries are guided by the aim to attain the ultimate unity of all knowledge; while he who stops with isolated facts as the final truth is an empiric."² "Systematized general thoughts, mirrored in the individual facts, constitute psychology."³ "Knowledge is the legitimately and certainly recognized (conscious) agreement of a percept or concept with its object."⁴

It is interesting to notice the author's view of metaphysics. He has long been a resident of Berlin, a member of some of the philosophical clubs in that city, and is familiar with the current ideas of Germany concerning philosophy. If he reflects the opinions of his associates, as seems to be the case, we must conclude that the metaphysics of the clouds has left Germany, probably to take lodgement in England. He speaks of Hegel's philosophy as having lost its supremacy more than forty years ago, and speaks of the doctrine of the identity of knowing and being as having been renounced. He speaks of metaphysics as calmly, we may say, as tamely, as Dugald Stewart might have done. He makes its aim to be seeking the beginning of all beginnings, says it must renounce its dreams and visions, put off its vagueness, prove its premises and rest in real solutions of its problems. In-

¹ P. 6.

² P. 54.

³ P. 148.

⁴ P. 187.

deed the author confines metaphysics (philosophy) within narrower limits than those admitted by the Scotch school, for he says that the mind never comes in contact with realities, that the world of consciousness is wholly phenomenal.¹ He teaches also that all knowledge must rest finally on certain necessary truths which need no demonstration,—a position which is still held by some to be a denial of all true science. In his appeal to Des Cartes' *Cogito ergo sum*, unlike the more ambitious philosophers of the time, he puts the emphasis on *sum* and simply infers the thinker from the thought.

¹ P. 221.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

PART I.

PRESENT STATE
OF
STUDIES IN HOMILETICS.
BY
REV. FRANKLIN W. FISK,
PROFESSOR OF SACRED RHETORIC
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

CHAPTER I.

THEORETICAL HOMILETICS—PREACHING.

THE GERMAN PULPIT: POINTS OF CONTRAST WITH THE AMERICAN PULPIT.

Although the great themes of which the pulpit treats should ever be the same, yet the manner of their presentation should always conform to national and individual education and characteristics. Hence in respect to forms of preaching there can be no one ideal form. Yet much that is valuable may be learned by a careful comparison of the methods employed by the pulpits of different nations.

Under the above title, the Rev. Dr. J. H. W. Stucken-berg of Berlin, Germany, in an instructive article in *The Homiletic Review* [Aug. 1887], has set forth the distinctive characteristics of the German pulpit, as contrasted with the American. After showing the forces that have made the pulpit of Germany what it is, he states that “Among present factors of special significance are the training of theological students; the relation of the Church to the State; the character of the congregation; the alienation of the masses; the religious indifference and skepticism manifested among the cultured classes and in literature; and the renewal of the conflict with Rome.” Students choose the ministry for much the same reasons that lead them to

enter the other professions. "Conversion and an ardent desire to promote the cause of Christ are not regarded as essential." Theological students in Germany "are not a little surprised to learn that in America emphasis is placed on personal piety, evidences of conversion, and motives for entering the ministry." "At present the practical training for the ministry is far superior in America." Since the Church is a State institution, "there is in it no sharp distinction between professors and non-professors of religion, all who have been baptized and confirmed being regarded as members of the church." Hence, sometimes, a single parish contains fifty thousand souls.

The German pulpit as contrasted with the American is more limited in its range of topics and less free in the discussion of them. But while it does not touch public and private life at as many points, it is kept more within the bounds of strict propriety. German congregations of whatever religious belief "are much more solemn than those in America. Showy dress at divine service is deemed vulgar." "The whole congregation rises and remains standing while the Scriptures are read." The pulpit is influenced by the reverent character of the congregation. Slang expressions and jokes would be regarded by the audience as an insult. The author significantly adds that "the German pulpit is not the place for the sensational; that is left to theaters and variety shows. Catching subjects are never announced or advertised. A congregation which cannot be attracted by the simple Word of God is not thought desirable." But in the effort to avoid sensationalism, the German pulpit is thought to be in danger of going to the other extreme.

The German pulpit is distinctively biblical and exegetical. Generally long texts are chosen, and the preaching is becoming topical rather than strictly textual. The most prominent excellence of the best German sermons is their Scriptural character. But they are addressed almost wholly to believers, which fact may account, in part, for the small attendance of those that are not communicants, at divine service. The sermon is often destitute of the personal element, and in many instances has in it too little intellectual freshness and vigor.

Sermons are generally delivered memoriter, and a pulpit tone prevails. The author regards the American pulpit as superior in delivery to that of Germany. He gives the following points in the German sermon from which the American pulpit can learn valuable lessons: "The Biblical character of the German sermon; its simplicity, so that all can understand it; its emphasis on the edification of faith; its careful regard of propriety, and its deep reverence."

This entire article of Dr. Stuckenbergs is suggestive and valuable to American preachers.

In a subsequent number of *The Homiletic Review* (June, 1888) Dr. Stuckenbergs enlarges somewhat on the points stated in this article. He thinks that "The prevalent German theory of the services of the Sanctuary as communion with God and as the edification of existing faith, determines the character of these services. Since they are adapted so exclusively to those already supposed to be Christians, it is not strange that the worldly are so rarely found at church. A writer says that, as a rule, 'only the pious attend divine services,' and hence the sermon is put under the head of 'the work of the church in its own

behalf.''" In this respect there is a wide contrast between the German, and the American and English pulpit. The writer says, that "The conviction is growing" [in Germany] "that the sermon must have more immediate reference to time, place and occasion, and must spring from the book and from the people, rather than from the study and the library." "The sermon must be modern—the old truth in modern language, in modern style, and adapted to modern hearers."

There is in Germany a deeply felt need of better training for the ministry than is now given at the university. "There is demand for living preachers, for men who have freely appropriated Christian truth, and are prepared to give testimony respecting its power." To secure the practical training for the ministry so generally demanded, candidates for it are urged to put themselves under the instruction of some pastor. "In order to enable them to do this, the Prussian government recently appropriated \$35,000, each student to receive while under charge of an older pastor \$250 per annum. They are to remain in such a position from one to two years." This would seem to be a movement in the right direction, and one full of promise for the future of the German pulpit.

THE SCOTTISH PULPIT.¹

Dr. Wm. M. Taylor has done excellent service to the ministry of our country in giving to the press his lectures

¹ *The Scottish Pulpit from the Reformation to the Present Day.*
By William M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1887.

on the Scottish Pulpit, recently delivered before the Divinity School of Yale University.

"The design of these sketches," says the author, "is neither to give a full account of Scottish Ecclesiastical History nor to furnish complete biographies of the men who have been prominent in the Scottish pulpit since the Reformation. My aim has simply been to put the preachers in the environment of their times, to bring out the characteristics by which they were distinguished, and to give point to such lessons from their work as may be useful in our own age."

The volume contains seven lectures, full of interesting and instructive information concerning the men who have been eminent as preachers in Scotland since the Reformation.

John Knox, more than any other preacher, the author thinks, made the Scottish Pulpit what it is to-day. He "set the fashion for the preachers who came after him." The pulpit was his throne. He never wrote his sermons, but preached from a few notes, carefully prepared. The form of his sermons was expository. "Having brought out the meaning of the passage, he then set himself to enforce its practical bearing on the circumstances of his hearers and his times, taking care first to establish the parallelism between the original case referred to by the sacred writer and that to which he applied it. This was the tip of the arrow, to which all else was but its feathers; and in the shooting of that arrow he spared neither age nor sex, neither rank nor class." Often his expositions extended through a whole book of Scripture. In doctrine he was Calvinistic, in speech clear, direct and forcible, in action

impassioned and often vehement. Three characteristics, Dr. Taylor thinks, were impressed by Knox upon the pulpit of Scotland—"its expository character, its vehemence of manner, and its unflinching courage."

The great preachers that followed Knox, down to the Revolution-settlement, were Andrew Melville, Alexander Henderson, Samuel Rutherford, and Robert Leighton. While the preaching of each had marked characteristics, it was like that of Knox, scholarly, expository, direct and courageous.

The name of Archbishop Leighton "marks the beginning of a new era in the history of the Scottish Pulpit." His discourses, while Calvinistic in substance, were rendered attractive by his great learning, fine imagination, beauty of style, and devout spirit. Although carefully written they were delivered without manuscript.

Contemporary with Leighton were such "Field-preachers" as Richard Cameron and Alexander Peden, who, driven forth from their flocks, preached with great power to "The Church in the Wilderness."

Then came, in the eighteenth century, the "Reign of the Moderates," so-called, whose preachers with little love for evangelistic truth cultivated assiduously literary graces, and in whose hands "the sermon became a mere literary product rather than an instrument for the conversion and edification of souls." Of this class the best representative was Dr. Hugh Blair.

The "Evangelicals" followed. The brothers Ebenezer and Ralph Erskine preached the old truth of the gospel with unwonted power. They wrote out their sermons and delivered them *memoriter*. One with them in spirit,

though in the National Church, were such able preachers as John Maclaurin, John Witherspoon, John Erskine, and Andrew Thomson, the last of whom united in his preaching the literary culture and graces of the “Moderates,” with the doctrines of the “Evangelicals.”

Then came the greatest of Scottish preachers—Thomas Chalmers. Remarkable as preacher, pastor and professor, he ruled with sovereign sway in the pulpit. Although he read his discourses closely, yet so rich and concentrated were his thoughts, so affluent his imagination, so forcible his speech, and so vehement his delivery, that he produced such effects as to cause the critical Jeffrey to say of his eloquence that “it reminded him more of what one reads of as the effect of the eloquence of Demosthenes than anything he ever saw.”

Nearly contemporary with Chalmers, there were in the pulpits of the dissenting churches such able preachers as Drs. Symington, McCrie, Brown, Eadie, King, Anderson, Wardlaw, Alexander, Macleod, Candlish, and Guthrie,—all of them characteristically Scotch in their preaching, and the last remarkable as a popular orator. Dr. Guthrie wrote his sermons with the greatest care, having his audience in imagination before him, filled them with apt and striking illustrations, and then delivered them *memoriter* with such grace and force and vividness of action that he carried all before him.

Dr. Taylor closes these excellent lectures, of which the briefest outline has been given, with two words of advice. “First, *be yourselves*. Pulpit efficiency is not a matter of method. There have been great preachers in all methods, with the paper and without it, extempore and memoriter,

expository and topical. The efficiency is not in the method, but in the man." . . . " And while you are thus careful to be yourselves, *do not preach yourselves*. Preach Christ. Beware of hiding him behind yourselves, rather hide yourselves behind him ; and while your audience hear the voice, let them 'see no man save Jesus only.' Do not make the sermon an end ; use it only as a means; and let your end be, not the gathering of a multitude, nor the making of a name for yourselves, but the saving of them that hear you, and then you will not lack success."

It is auspicious for the American pulpit that it seems to be addressing itself, more of late years than formerly, to the exposition of Scripture. This tendency will be promoted, as we think, by Dr. Taylor's volume on *The Scottish Pulpit*.

ENGLISH IN THE PULPIT.¹

This is one of the five papers which make up the volume entitled *Our English*, by Prof. Hill of Harvard University. The other essays are on English in Schools ; English in Colleges ; English in Newspapers and Novels : and Colloquial English.

The papers that compose this volume are worthy of being taken from the periodicals in which they first appeared, and put into this permanent form. As a whole, they are interesting, suggestive and instructive treatments of the topics named.

But we are inclined to think that the paper with the

¹ *Our English* : by Adams Sherman Hill. New York : Harper Brothers, 1889.

title *English in the Pulpit* is the least valuable of the five. In treating this subject, the author seems to have forgotten the proverb, *Ne sutor ultra crepidam*,—and, not confining himself strictly to his subject, to have ranged well-nigh over the whole domain of Homiletics. On this general subject he has presented in the main valuable thoughts, many of which have been quoted from authors of acknowledged eminence in Homiletics. Indeed, about one-fifth of the paper is taken from these authors. We cannot but think that, had the scholarly author confined himself closely to his theme, and written only on that in which he is confessedly a proficient, he would have done better service to the ministers for whom he wrote.

The author well says that “The tests of English in the pulpit, then, are to be sought in the pews. It follows,—since the people who go to church are, in our days, very much the same in the pews and out of them.—it follows that a preacher cannot hope to interest and impress his hearers unless he uses language which they readily understand, language with which they are familiar in the best books they read and the best speakers they hear.” He condemns “in prayer and in sermon, pet expressions that sound to some ears like cant; as ‘uncovenanted mercies,’ ‘beatific vision,’ ‘unsearchable dispensations,’ ‘sin-polluted lips,’ ‘unspeakable and everlasting felicity reserved for the saints.’” But “Some preachers who avoid ecclesiastical formulas fall into philosophical ones; as ‘will-power,’ ‘subjective and objective,’ ‘the categories of the Infinite.’ Others indulge in sentimental phrases; as ‘greenness and beauty,’ ‘sweetness and light,’ ‘love-service,’ ‘soul-building.’” He thinks that a reaction against ecclesiastical

phrases has lately set in that has led to a style of writing and speaking not less objectionable. "It may be doubted," he well says, "whether it is not better to venerate form and symbols than to venerate nothing; to talk an ecclesiastical *patois*, rather than to borrow slang and vulgarisms from the streets; to use phrases which, though now out of date, were once charged with a sacred meaning, rather than those which embody a whim of the moment, and will pass away with the occasion that spawned them; to preach like a good though old-fashioned book, rather than to bawl like a loud-voiced stump-orator."

This slang of the streets, like malaria, is forcing its way into cultivated society and into some pulpits. But though the minister that indulges in it may thus gratify certain hearers, and draw others like them to hear him, yet in time he will surely lose in influence more than he gains by catering to this vitiated taste.

Professor Hill truly says, "Both the ecclesiastical-sentimental and the sensational extreme are avoided by the best modern preachers. Shunning theological and philosophical pedantry in every form, and vulgarity of every species, they draw their language from the well of English undefiled. Their sermons contain no words that the hearers cannot readily understand, and none that shock the sensibilities or offend the taste. Their manner is simple, straightforward, free from affectation either solemn or petty."

STORY TELLING IN THE PULPIT.

In no one respect, perhaps, does the sermon of to-day differ more from the sermon of a century ago, than in

that of illustration. From being stiffly formal and dryly logical, it has, like the rod of Aaron, budded and blossomed into abundant illustrations. Indeed, in some instances, this tendency has been so strong, that it has made the sermon degenerate into little else than a tissue of stories. But the illustrative tendency in the modern sermon, if properly regulated, is very useful in making the truth vivid and impressive. The great Teacher who knew what was in man, made frequent use of most varied illustrations. But whether they were drawn from real life, or were "invented examples," they were all true to nature and to life.

In *The Homiletic Review* (Aug., 1887), Dr. Edward Everett Hale treats in an interesting and instructive way of *Story Telling in the Pulpit*. In advocating illustrative preaching, he expresses decided preference, when stories are told, for those drawn from real history rather than from imagination. Hence a preacher should be well read in history and biography, that he may gather from these sources, fresh and appropriate illustrations of the truth. But he should see to it that they are absolutely accurate.

He may, however, freely use the "invented example," provided that it is true to nature and life, and such that the good sense of an audience not absolutely friendly, may be satisfied that the moral it contains is not forced or exaggerated.

To show how much longer people remember an illustration of a truth than an abstract statement of it, the author relates a conversation which he had with Dr. George Putnam, at the close of a service in which the latter had delivered an able discourse. In reply to the

inquiry how he had constructed the sermon, he said "that it was an old sermon, excepting the illustrations ; the illustrations were new. Then he added, very seriously, that in practice, people remember nothing of a sermon excepting the illustrations ; that the philosophical or ethical statement does not rest in fixed form upon their minds, while they would probably remember the illustrations as long as they lived. In point of fact, this same sermon had been preached to the same congregation within two years, and yet, so far as appeared, none of them knew that." We doubt, however, that such general ignorance of this fact was the case, and we think it perilous both to the reputation and to the influence of a preacher to repeat sermons "to the same congregation within two years," however plethoric or gaunt in illustrations they may be. On this point two distinguished ministers were comparing notes. One said, "It is astonishing how frequently I can preach a sermon over again to my people, if I take out of it all the white bears" (striking illustrations). To which the other replied, "When I preach a sermon over again to my people, I put in more white bears." He had the right of it. A sermon that is to be preached again to the same congregation within a few years, should generally be, if not wholly rewritten, improved by new illustrations, and not mutilated by removing whatever good ones it has.

The author, we are glad to see, condemns the "hunting for a story (in some 'book of godly stories') because you know your statement is poor, or your sermon is dull." He prefers as an illustration "one of the familiar stories of Scripture," and next, "a thoroughly familiar

story in history, or in general literature." But he considers it "perfectly legitimate to construct your whole parable," whenever you find it desirable to do so. In such case, it seems to us that there should be some intimation given that the illustration is an "invented example." But whether an illustration be an historical one or an "invented example," it should be true to life. We have heard from the pulpit stories told as true, that were evidently false.

THE VALUE OF HISTORICAL STUDIES TO THE PULPIT.

In *The Homiletic Review* for June, 1888, Prof. J. O. Murray, D.D., Dean of Princeton College, has an able and suggestive article on *Historical Studies: Their Homiletic Value*. He is of the opinion that a good knowledge of history, profane as well as sacred, is of great practical benefit to the preacher. He asserts with confidence that a study of human history will throw light on the scriptural teachings concerning mankind; that history offers to the ministry a no less interesting field in its disclosures of the Divine Providence in human events; that historical studies inspire hopeful views as to the moral progress of mankind; that they throw light on social questions coming up to confront the Church of Christ; and that they furnish the ministry with a fund of apt and telling illustrations. "These are to be found in every possible variety—now in an incident, now in the saying of a wise man, now in the career of an individual, in the turn of a battle, in the accident of a life, in the progress of a revolution." But, he adds, "I would not for a moment be understood as saying

that history should be primarily studied by the ministry in order to go on a still hunt for illustrations. But, pursuing historical studies for the weightier reasons already given, then let the minister keep ready his note-book, if his memory is not perfect, and jot down in it the illustrative fact or the incident to be used in the day of need."

THE MEN, THE TRAINING, AND THE PREPARATION, FOR THE PULPIT.

The Rev. Dr. W. Ormiston, in recent numbers of *The Homiletic Review*,¹ has briefly but ably treated of *The Men, the Training, and the Preparation, for the pulpit*. "The ministry of the gospel," he well says, "is a service for which special fitness and peculiar preparation are requisite: the gift of the Spirit, severe mental discipline, careful study of the word, some religious experience, and varied and extensive culture." "The service implies, on the part of him who enters it, not only a whole-hearted, earnest, sincere, manly faith in Christ and his gospel, but also a spirit of cheerful self-sacrifice, and absolute self-renunciation, a willingness to spend and be spent in the work for HIM and for his people."

Under the Topic of *The Men for the Pulpit*, Dr. Ormiston thus sums up what he regards as essential, or at least as exceedingly desirable, in those who are to enter the ministry. "The men for the pulpit should possess good bodily health, intellectual ability, mental vigor, moral courage, heroic self-denial, strong common sense, spiritual fervor, and unreserved consecration."

¹ Vol. xiv, No. 6, Dec. 1887; vol. xv, No. 3, March, 1888; vol. xv, No. 5, May, 1888.

Would that it were as easy to find such young men in sufficient numbers for the ministry, as it is to describe them. They are to-day the great need of the churches and of the world. And if our churches are to continue to have godly, learned, and able ministers, they must not passively wait for them, but must select the choicest sons of their household, and set them forth on a course of training for the pulpit. Every self-supporting church should, during a series of years, put at least as many young men into the ministry as, for that time, it appropriates to itself. Indeed, it must do much more than this, if it is to do its part in evangelizing the world. In a conference recently held by the Home Missionary Superintendents from nine of the Northwestern States and Territories, with the Faculty of Chicago Theological Seminary, it was found, by the most careful estimate, that, for the present and future supply of the pressing needs of the churches and regions represented by those Superintendents, there would be annually needed for the next five years 210 more ministers, while the sad fact appeared that, from the seven Congregational Theological Seminaries in our country, there were graduated the present year only 92 students in the regular course.

Under the head of *The Training for the Pulpit*, though Dr. Ormiston advocates the most thorough preparation in the Hebrew and Greek exegesis of the Scriptures that theological schools can give, in the case of students who can take such a course with advantage, yet he thinks that the curriculum in most of our theological seminaries "might be so modified as to furnish greater facilities and higher advantages to different classes of students, and to conduce much more extensively to the furtherance of the best inter-

ests of the church, specially as relates to her extension." He thinks that there are many theological students whose talents and attainments are such, that they would be better prepared for the ministry by a three years' course of English studies, in which the English Bible should hold a prominent place, than by being subjected to the customary drill in the Hebrew and the Greek Scriptures, of which they will gain at best only a superficial knowledge. "The training for the pulpit," he thinks, "should have reference to the work to be performed, and inasmuch as diverse gifts are bestowed and various ministries are required—as teaching, preaching, pastoral work, and evangelistic services—some option in the course of studies might, with utmost propriety, be allowed, and thus differences in the age, attainments and purpose of the students would be provided for." But he would have *"all* the students rigidly trained, both by written and oral exercises in homiletics, the work of the pastorate, the subject of missions, both foreign and domestic, specially in the best methods of evangelistic services in sparsely settled parts of the country and in towns and cities."

With these views of Dr. Ormiston, Prof. William C. Wilkinson in the main agrees.¹ He would make the studies of the course elective, with the one very important exception of the Bible. He "would require every seminary student to go through the entire Bible in English under a teacher before becoming a graduate either of the seminary or of any department in the seminary." With this sole exception, he would establish the elective system. "I would erect," he says, "each department of instruc-

¹ *The Homiletic Review*, Vol. xv, No. 2.

tion belonging to the seminary into a kind of independent sovereignty by itself, holding to the institution, as a whole, somewhat the relation of the individual State to the general government in our own American political system. Each department under the autoocracy of the responsible head of the department, should have full power and authority to graduate its students. Graduation from all the different departments should constitute, in the end, graduation from the seminary as a whole. I have thus indicated the organization actually, I believe adopted, from the example of the University of Virginia, by the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, as also, more recently, from the model of the Louisville institution, by the 'Baptist College,' a theological seminary in Toronto.

The different departments are, in these institutions, called 'schools.' There will, for example, be the 'School' of Hebrew, the 'School' of New Testament Exegesis, the 'School' of Church History, and so on. The Seminary is the collective group of these several 'schools.' "The obvious advantages of this plan," he adds, "are very great, and the disadvantages are practically nothing. The disadvantage likely first to be thought of, in instinctive objection, is that students, remitted to their own preferences, might often, in leaving out the studies to which they were least inclined, leave out the studies of which they were most in need. But election would, of course, always be made by the student somewhat under the advice and direction of the faculty, whose influence could practically, in every individual instance, be carried as far as might be found desirable toward the limit of the virtually compulsory." He thinks that one great advantage of the

new organization would be that both students and professors would be incited to greater zeal in their studies and to better work, while the disadvantages would be "practically nothing." Prof. Wilkinson is of the opinion, that "under the mediaeval system that prevails, we waste more than half our teaching force." He has no fear that ministerial scholarship would suffer, should Hebrew and Greek no longer be required of ministerial students. Indeed, he thinks that "ministerial scholarship would in fact gain, rather than lose, by the change proposed." "Undoubtedly," he adds, "it is better for a minister to be a good scholar in Hebrew and a good scholar in Greek, if such he may be, than it is to be utterly ignorant of those languages; but I insist it is better that he be utterly ignorant of those languages, than that he impose on himself, or impose on others, the idea of his knowing something effective in this line when, in fact, he knows nothing whatever as he ought to know. The pulpit suffers, perhaps, less by ignorance than it suffers by vain pretension of knowing. Scholarship is good; but genuineness is still better than scholarship. Let us have genuine scholars; and willing students will be found to have made the only genuine scholars. But let us also admit that men may make first-rate preachers, and not be more than third-rate scholars." He emphasizes the fact that "The theological seminary exists in order to make preachers and pastors." "If scholars, if exegetes, if commentators, if professors, as distinguished from actual ministers, are also made, that, I take it, is incidental, accidental almost. The seminary is not founded, is not maintained, ought not to be administered, for that. The theological seminary, I repeat,

exists in order to train preachers and pastors. Let us keep this fundamental fact in mind and govern ourselves accordingly."

Under the head of *Preparation for the Pulpit*,¹ Dr. Ormiston has put much wisdom into few words. He thinks it essential that the preacher have strong convictions himself and be firmly persuaded in his own mind of the absolute truth and momentous importance of what he proposes to declare, that he thoroughly understand his subject, and that he have a distinct aim in his discourse, and have practical sympathy with both his theme and his audience. The preacher in the pulpit must remember that he is a herald not an advocate, an ambassador not a philosopher, and that his great mission is to preach Christ and him crucified. "Careful, honest and thorough preparation is indispensable to one who would acceptably and profitably attempt to persuade men to acknowledge the Lord Jesus as their Master and to give themselves to him."

In constructing sermons, he would have no invariable form, yet would always have "a definite plan distinctly formed and followed throughout."

As to the delivery of the discourse, the preacher may use full notes or none, but if he speaks without notes—perhaps the better method for those who can—he must make careful preparation and frequent use of the pen. On this point Dr. Ormiston gives his long and valuable experience. "For many years I used neither note nor outline in the pulpit; then I used a mere outline or analysis of the discourse. During later years I have taken more copious

notes to the pulpit with me. Seldom, however, have I ever read a full manuscript, except on some special occasion; and now, after forty years' service in the work of the ministry, I can use any of the methods mentioned. During all my ministry, except when called upon to preach so frequently that I had no leisure to write, I have constantly used the pen, and continue to prepare with as much assiduity and pains as I did in the first years of my ministry."

He closes his series of articles with the following golden words to young ministers: "I would earnestly advise all young preachers to bear in mind that the pulpit is their throne, and to urge upon them the necessity of constant, thorough preparation for every service. Never serve at the altar except with 'beaten oil.' No personal charm of manner, no special grace of deportment, no social qualities, however pleasing—not even pastoral work, however faithfully performed—will atone for failure in the pulpit. To any who may have the gift of ready utterance this counsel is specially necessary. Mere fluency of speech is not necessarily eloquence; nor is an unprepared and irrelevant harangue, however rapidly or boisterously uttered, a sermon. Never go to the pulpit without a prepared message, and then deliver it in the best way you can. Do the very best you can every time you preach."

WOMAN IN THE PULPIT.¹

It is almost too trite to say that woman largely owes her present position to the teachings of Christianity as set forth by the pulpit. Christianity has taken her by the hand, and led her side by side with her brother man, into well-nigh every employment and profession. And the question now presses, Why should she not be admitted also to the pulpit that has already done so much to exalt her? Why should the Christian ministry be the only one of the professions from which she is excluded? She is earnestly seeking admission to the pulpit. Is it the Bible or prejudice that is keeping her out? This question Miss Willard attempts to answer in her little volume. She maintains that there is no ground either in Scripture or in reason for the exclusion of woman from the pulpit, and that such exclusion comes mainly from prejudice and false interpretation of the Bible.

The book, introduced by letters of approval from Rev. Dr. Joseph Parker, Rev. Dr. Talmage, and Rev. Joseph Cook, is divided into seven chapters, in the first five of which the author endeavors to defend her position. The sixth chapter contains the reply of the Rev. Dr. Henry J. Van Dyke, Sr., which appeared originally in the *Homiletic Review* for December, 1887; and the last chapter is given to a counter reply by Professor L. T. Townsend.

The first chapter under the title, *The Letter Killeth*, is mainly given to an exegesis of those Biblical passages that are generally regarded as opposed to the author's views. The method of exegesis is to show that these pas-

¹ *Woman in the Pulpit.* By Frances E. Willard. Boston. D. Lothrop Company, 1888.

sages, if taken literally, would be directly at variance with other parts of Scripture, and hence cannot have a literal interpretation. They had reference only to certain transient social conditions and customs, and when these passed away became obsolete. This literalizing of the Scriptural passages regarding woman, is largely owing, the author thinks, to the one-sided interpretation of male exegetes. "We need women commentators to bring out the women's side of the book; we need the stereoscopic view of truth in general, which can only be had when woman's eye and man's together shall discern the perspective of the Bible's full-orbed revelation."

The second chapter under the title, *The Spirit Giveth Life*, is chiefly taken up with argument in support of the author's position, and answering such objections to it as that "no woman was called to be an apostle;" that "it will disrupt the home;" and that "if we open the flood-gates" (by admitting women to the pulpit) "we cannot tell what may happen." "To ministerial leaders" opposed to the ordination of women, the author asks, "Shall women ordain themselves?", and significantly adds, "We stand once more at the parting of the roads; shall the bold, resolute men among our clergy win the day and give ordination to women, or shall women take this matter into their own hands? Fondly do women hope, and earnestly do they pray, that the churches they love may not drive them to this extremity."

In the third chapter the author replies to "The earth-born argument" that the vocations of minister and mother are irreconcilable; and in the two following chapters brings forward the "Testimony of preachers who are

men," and the "Testimony of women preachers" to show that they are entirely compatible.

In direct antagonism to this position of the author, Dr. Van Dyke brings forward these four principal objections, viz.: *Women have no special qualifications for the work of the ministry;* *Women have special disqualifications for the ministry;* *Women are not authorized to enter the ministry;* *The Word of God expressly excludes and prohibits women from the work of the ministry.* These positions he supports with much ability and with apparent candor.

Then Professor Townsend gallantly enters the lists in behalf of Miss Willard, and begins the contest by "a flat denial" of every one of Dr. Van Dyke's positions, and follows up his assertion by a course of argument similar to that of the author. He stoutly maintains that women *have* special qualifications for the ministry; that *as women* they have no special disqualifications for it; that they *are* authorized to enter it; and that though "The Word of God expressly excludes and prohibits *some* women" (as those in the Corinthian church) "from the work of the ministry," it does not exclude them *all*, but, on the contrary, throws the door of the pulpit wide open as well to women as to men.

Professor Townsend closes his able reply with the following advice: "The noble women" (those that "have exceptional qualifications to meet all the conditions required of men who enter the ministry") "should knock only once more at the doors of the Methodist General Conference, and if their signals and entreaties are again uncivilly disregarded they should never knock again; they should call together some of the noblest Christian women

of the land, and, in solemn convocation, by the laying on of hands and by prayer, they should set apart for pulpit and parish work those who trust that they are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon themselves the office of the ministry in the Church of Christ, to serve God for the promoting of his glory and the edifying of his people.''"

It is somewhat surprising that Professor Townsend does not reply to the last and strongest argument of Dr. Van Dyke, based upon the two reasons given by the apostle in I Tim. ii, 12-14, and stated thus: "Both the injunction and the reason for it" (I Cor. xiv, 34) "are repeated by the apostle in a passage where the application cannot possibly be restricted to any church or any period of Christianity, because the reason is rooted in the history of creation and in the divinely appointed relation of the sexes. 'I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.' (I Tim. ii, 12-14.)" He adds, "We have no apology to offer for these words nor for the quotation of them. There is not space to expound their meaning and attempt to adjust them to the varied relations of our modern church life. It is not necessary, for the purposes of this discussion, to do so. For, whatever else they forbid or prohibit, they certainly do prohibit women from assuming the office of the Christian ministry. The real scholarship of the Church has always so understood them."

While we regard this advocacy of the ordination of women by Miss Willard and Professor Townsend as, on

the whole, the ablest that we have read, yet we confess that we cannot quite see the consistency of this view with a reasonable interpretation of the two facts adduced by the Apostle Paul, under Divine inspiration, as the two reasons for his injunction (I Tim. ii, 13-14.). But we welcome this discussion.

THE PULPIT AND MODERN SKEPTICISM.

There has been running through recent numbers of *The Homiletic Review*¹ a series of eight articles by able divines in answer to the question, How can the Pulpit best Counteract the Influence of Modern Skepticism? Only the briefest outline of these able papers will be given, that it may be seen at a glance how some of the best thinkers in the pulpit answer this question.

The first article is by the Rev. N. West, D. D., of St. Paul, Minn. To him the inquiry resolves itself into this, "How best the minister of Christ may meet successfully and counteract the various forms of Naturalism, so current in our times." He regards Modern Skepticism as "simply an inheritance from times gone by, an ancient legacy revived in modern days." "It is a part of the 'immortal conflict' the ages have transmitted." The early Christian preachers, as Paul and Peter and John, and their associates, and their successors for two hundred and fifty years, met and counteracted the influence of such skepticism simply by the "Word of God." "They were teachers of the truth, and preachers of the gospel of the Son of God." "That was the way they 'counteracted the influence' of skepticism in all its subtle forms."

¹ Vol. xiii, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6; Vol. xiv, Nos. 1, 4, 5; Vol. xv, No. 1.

The preacher should follow the same course to-day. He should study to show himself approved unto God, should be thoroughly familiar with the Bible, and above all should "Preach the Word," should preach Christ. For to preach Christ "is to preach all truth and to refute all error at the same time."

The second paper is by the Rev. E. G. Robinson, D. D., President of Brown University. Skepticism is described as existing in varying degrees of intensity from mere doubt up to a broad and unqualified denial, not only of every trace of the supernatural in Christianity, but of the possibility of any authoritative revelation of the divine will, other than that given in the uniform processes of nature. For the pulpit "wholly to ignore it is not safe, even if it were practicable. To be perpetually attacking it is unwise, as well as perverse of the true purpose of the pulpit. But to remove honest doubts, and to make clear to both believers and unbelievers the real and just grounds of Christian faith, is doubtless a legitimate part of the pulpit's true function." President Robinson regards formal attempts to overthrow skeptics by direct attacks on their positions as pretty sure to end in loss of labor and waste of opportunity, since, as a rule, they do not come within the reach of the pulpit, and if they do, they are not in an attitude of mind to be convinced. He thinks that "Formal attempts at a refutation of modern skepticism in ordinary pulpit ministrations are also a waste of opportunity," inasmuch as there are almost always present "some who are hungering, possibly famishing, for the bread of life; and they, at the best, are put off with mere assurance that the bread they crave is the true bread

from heaven,—a something which they had never thought of questioning.” Often the pulpit in attempting to refute skepticism sows the seeds of skepticism itself.

The best method of dealing with skepticism is the method of the gospel with individual men. It seeks the heart, since out of it are the issues of life. “The appeal of the preacher, therefore, should be at once to the moral consciousness of his hearers, whether believers or unbelievers, for it is only within the moral consciousness that the heart can be reached, and the conscience set to work.”

Of this best method of counteracting the influence of skepticism by the pulpit, the author adduces the example of three illustrious preachers of the present century—Schleiermacher and Tholuck in Germany, and LaCordaire in France. “The work of the gospel,” he concisely adds, “is not so much to convince that it may convict, as it is to convict that it may convince and thus convert; and conviction can be accomplished only through an awakened conscience. The skeptic must be arraigned at the bar of his own conscience, or all pleading with him will be vain and unprofitable.”

President Robinson closes his suggestive article with a thought worthy of careful consideration. “Few things in the pulpit of our time are more mischievous in their influence than the pious flings at skeptics and caricatures of their opinions, sometimes heard from well-meaning preachers who are indebted for all they know of the real grounds of skepticism to the third or fourth hand statements of the penny-a-liners of the magazines and newspapers.”

The third paper is from the pen of President Henry A.

Buttz, D. D., of Drew Theological Seminary. He defines skepticism as "every kind of doctrine which proposes to set aside the Word of God as the sole rule of faith and practice, whether it be the philosophy of our time, or the so-called higher criticism which would undermine the very foundations of our faith." The indirect influence of modern skepticism takes mainly two forms,—it produces indifference to all religion, and also an aversion to the Church as the representative of Christianity. It specially affects two classes—young men in the process of education, and the working classes of our large cities.

"If the pulpit proposes an aggressive attitude, it must have a thorough comprehension of the views of those whom it would convert, and of the reasons which are alleged in their support." "The ignorant discussion of skepticism is more damaging to truth than to the error, for it promotes antagonism and furnishes no antidote."

The pulpit, the writer maintains, should wait patiently, and investigate the effects of the statements of supposed antagonists before concluding that they are destructive of the truth. "Give a fair hearing to the honest investigations and conclusions of responsible men whoever they may be." He would urge upon the pulpit a careful sifting and patient waiting in all matters of genuine criticism for which real scholarship offers apparently satisfactory reasons. The pulpit must also loyally adhere to Christian truth and its thorough exposition. It must count the cost and defend only what is defensible.

The pulpit cannot surrender any part of the sacred volume that has come down to us. Its great doctrines should be clearly set forth and maintained, and the views of op-

ponents plainly stated. The pulpit, the author believes, can most effectively counteract modern skepticism by strong statements of the evidences of historic facts derived from the Scriptures themselves; by addressing itself to the conditions and circumstances of those who reject its beliefs; by an example corresponding to our faith, and the personal influence which grows out of such a life. "This personal, silent influence, going out from every church, and from every Christian home through the influence of the pulpit, is the last resort, the final method of counteracting modern skepticism." The apostle Paul illustrates this method. "His words without his life, would have been inspiring, but with his example they are irresistible." So pre-eminently of the Master himself. "No instructions like his. But O, that wonderful life. It is the miracle of history." "In the midst of the world's questionings of thought, in the midst of its turmoils and struggles for place and power, the pulpit proclaims a single life, the life of Jesus, a single death, the death of Jesus, a solitary resurrection, the resurrection of Jesus. He is the best antidote to the skepticism of this age and of all ages."

The fourth paper of the series is by the Rev. Dr. A. J. Gordon of Boston, Mass. He believes "that against much of the current unbelief, nothing is accomplished by the martial posture of argumentation and disputation. One can hardly be theologically dissuaded from that of which he has never been logically persuaded, or reasoned out of that which was never reasoned into him." He regards infidelity as largely the result of intellectual ease and indolence, rather than of intellectual acumen. It comes more from the heart than from the head.

The conversion of the skeptic, therefore, is the first remedy which the writer suggests against modern skepticism. The case of the conversion of Herr Von Schleumbach is adduced to show that the skeptic is overcome rather by Christian testimony and example, than by argument. "If the thousand pulpits and churches in our land would concentrate their prayers, their faith and their tender persuasions upon such skeptics as come within their range, what inroads would be made upon unbelief within a few years?" "Let us lay down the cudgel and take up the cross."

The author also urges the use of *spiritual and supernatural weapons* in resisting skepticism. Examples can be given of "abandoned drunkards instantly saved and delivered from their appetite by prayer and faith in Jesus Christ; opium eaters of the most desperate type emancipated in a moment by the believing intercession of the Church, coupled with their own faith; and the sick raised up in answer to earnest prayer." "The most striking conversions from skepticism which we have known under our ministry, have been effected by the testimony of these emancipated slaves of sin and disease." Certainly the reality of the new birth as evinced by the godly life will be the most convincing proof of the truth of Christianity which can be presented.

The Rev. Dr. Jesse B. Thomas of Brooklyn, N. Y., furnishes the fifth paper in the discussion. The question resolves itself into this—How, if at all, may pulpit methods be most wisely modified to meet the emergency caused by modern skepticism? After giving wise cautions as to place, time and preacher in the discussion of modern skepticism, the writer proceeds to inquire, *What is there*

in the nature of modern skepticism, or in its relations to social or intellectual conditions, that entitle it to new or special treatment from the Pulpit? From the Reformation inaugurated by Luther, the “great questioner of things established,” have sprung “the developing sense of individualism in Christianity;” “a clearer conception of intelligence and freedom of choice, as the necessary basis of Christian discipleship;” and “an imperious demand for fact as the only legitimate basis of faith.”

The question then comes, “*How may the Pulpit most wisely deal with the subject?*” to which the author replies that “*The Pulpit ought judiciously, but candidly, to recognize and comment upon the difficulties suggested by modern skepticism.*” It should not be deterred by protests, by the dread of the contamination of suggested error, or because the difficulties in question are old or even perennial, nor again because they wholly belong to another hemisphere and so are irrelevant in the pulpit.

Moreover “*The Pulpit ought to make clear the distinction between skepticism and honest inquiry.*” The inquirer will not believe without reason, the skeptic will not believe at all. It is essential that Christianity be vindicated from the suspicion of hindering the search for truth.

The author adds that “*The Pulpit may reclaim in defense of truth much of the testimony which modern skepticism has perverted to its own ends.*” “It may be that modern skepticism will prove to have been one of the ‘offenses’ that ‘must needs come,’ to draw the pulpit back from the lingering haze of a scholasticism, thin and distant as the milky way, to the more concrete and familiar ways of the earth and men. Perhaps in studying the phenom-

ena it has brought to light, in order to learn the secret of its fascination, the preacher may find in those phenomena themselves a fascination which may hint to him how he may so speak that the common people 'will hear him gladly.'

Rev. William A. Snively, D. D., of Brooklyn, N. Y., contributes the sixth paper. The answer to the question "will depend, first of all, upon our conception of what the specific function of the Christian pulpit is." It will be generally conceded that the pulpit is a teacher neither of philosophy nor of theology. It is not to give a detailed refutation of the various forms of prevailing skepticism. This would rather disseminate than counteract the skepticism of the day. It should also be remembered that intellectual conviction is not the sole object of pulpit instruction. The skepticism of the day is voluntary, of the intellect and the reason, rather than of the moral nature of man seeking earnestly the knowledge of the truth. But the voice of God within the soul is a more powerful element in man than the decisions of his intellect or the conclusions of his reason. It was not to the reason nor to the doubt, but to the conscience that the apostle Paul made his appeal.

To the question, How shall the pulpit protect those who are sincere in their faith, from the fatal effects of the malaria which is in the very atmosphere they breathe? the writer replies that the answer will be found in the true conception of the work of the Christian pulpit, which meets all the necessities of the case,—that "it is not a teacher of philosophy, nor a lyceum lecture on current topics, but as bearing a divine message of pardon and

peace from God to man ; and which, standing before the world, in Christ's stead, beseeches men to be reconciled to God." "In other words, the best way for the pulpit to counteract the influence of modern skepticism is to spread the positive truth of the gospel, fearlessly and boldly, for the acceptance of faith, rather than to construct argumentative apologies and refutations for those who refuse to accept its message."

The author adds that there are other places than the pulpit where modern skepticism may be met and opposed, as the lecture-room and the platform, or through the pages of the review and the magazine, while "The first concern of the pulpit must be, not 'to banish and drive away strange doctrine,' but to nourish and strengthen the souls committed to its care."

The seventh article contributed to the discussion is by the Rev. Dr. Donald Fraser of London, England. He thinks that while there is no reason to fear the discomfiture of the modern pulpit, it should be wide awake to prevalent questions and "oppositions," and carefully state and calmly argue the positions impugned. The counsels which he would give to "the man in the pulpit" are the following:

1. Avoid all scorn and impatience. Instruct in meekness, above all do not threaten when you cannot persuade.
2. Explain the nature of the proof of which religious truth is capable. Show the distinction between moral evidence and scientific demonstration, and notice the fact that the eminent jurists of Christendom are, almost without exception, convinced of the Divine authority of the New Testament.

3. Be quite frank with the people about the formation of the Bible. Such a course will not shake but rather confirm their faith.

4. Give full consideration to moral difficulties in the way of faith. The pulpit should not only show that though immoral conduct is recorded in the Bible, it has no sanction there, but also it should vigorously set forth the positive moral claims of Revelation on the veneration and acceptance of every healthy-minded man.

5. Lay stress, not so much on Christ's miracles, as on Christ Himself. While by no means giving up the arguments for miracles, the pulpit should set forth Christ Himself as the wonder of wonders. "Skepticism cannot explain Him. Scoffers cannot disparage Him. Cultured critics cannot indicate how he might be improved. Concentrate on Him, Christ the defense and vindication of Christianity."

6. Bring the pulpit to bear more than ever on the characters and lives of those who profess and call themselves Christians. The skeptic must hold his peace when you show to him good men and women rejoicing in the cross of Christ. Although comparatively few adherents of Christianity "walk worthy" of it, yet the pulpit must not shrink from applying the test. "It must be evangelically ethical. It must build up character; it must purify life. It must insist on rectitude. It must teach the people that they, and they only, can refute the skeptic on this line." "If the people called Christians would only obey these lessons, and follow Him whom they call Master and Lord, they would do more than whole libraries of Apologetics,

or even so much pulpit argumentation, can do to disconcert and defeat Modern Skepticism."

The Rev. Robert F. Sample, D.D., of New York, contributes the last paper to the discussion. He regards *modern* skepticism as largely a resuscitated doubt, or an antiquated error. The old enemies of the Christian faith are wearing new clothes.

In reply to the inquiry, How can the pulpit best counteract the influence of modern skepticism? he notices two or three ways of impairing its influence, and then emphasizes the best way.

1. Offensive attack. Yet, after all, comparatively little has been accomplished by this method.

2. The defensive attitude may be assumed. Doubtless apologetics have their place, but apologetic preaching is liable to create skepticism.

3. The simple preaching of the gospel, without controversy and without apology, the author regards as the best means of counteracting the influence of error. "Truth is the antidote of error. When the sun rises the night flees away."

It is also well, he thinks, to present the sterner truths of the gospel in dealing with skepticism. While the pulpit should give prominence to the love of God, it should not forget that all the divine attributes, including God's justice, holiness and power, unite in the nature and expression of infinite love.

And then, "Let the pulpit be linked to the cross," and we need not fear the final result. This the history of the Church abundantly shows.

"The minister who preaches Christ has *Human Con-*

sciounesss on his side." Although blinded by sin the human mind will recognize, and the human heart will respond to the truth of the gospel.

"The gospel preacher has also the *Church* on his side." This moral support will greatly aid him in dealing with skepticism.

"The preacher of the gospel has *God* on his side." Such a ministry He will uphold and bless. But "Preaching that is on the circumference of truth and never reaches its center, that deals with the questions of the times with no hint of eternity; that gratifies human pride, never humbles it; that entertains with speculations, attracts by its grotesqueness, or startles by its dramatic action, but seldom or never tells the story of Him who died and rose and, for us sinners, went up on high, will neither be owned of God, nor have saving power with men."

YALE LECTURES ON PREACHING AND OTHER WRITINGS.¹

This large octavo volume of more than six hundred closely printed pages is a fitting memorial of its late gifted and lamented author. It consists of twenty Lectures on Preaching, delivered at the Yale Divinity School, eight Addresses, and nine Sermons, together with Foreign Letters, and memorial Addresses by President Dwight and Drs. Twichell and Parker.

The lectures on preaching take so wide a range and include so much material, that only a few of the more important and valuable suggestions can be here noticed.

¹ *Yale Lectures on Preaching and other Writings.* By Nathaniel J. Burton, D. D. New York: Chas. L. Webster and Company. London: Chatto and Windus, 1888.

These suggestions are all the more valuable because they grew out of Dr. Burton's experience as a preacher.

In his lecture on Making Sermons, after remarking that he does not know that there is anything on earth so interesting as a preacher and his habits, to preachers, he goes on to give his notions and methods in sermon making.

In getting a topic, he would allow the largest range of freedom while keeping within the lines of Christianity. He found that topics came to him not only from the Bible but also "from all points of the compass." These he put down in a book of subjects. Having selected a topic upon which to discourse, he thus graphically describes the method by which he gets "a host of thoughts on that topic." "I go to my desk and my pen and my paper, and there sit waiting for thoughts. I open all my windows hospitably, so that if they want to come in they can. And they almost always want to. Somehow they hear that I am there. Why do all the winds of heaven pour down towards a vacuum? Why do all the birds of heaven pour down through zones and zones seeking the summer? Why do all the waters of the world drift down towards any hollow anywhere? And why does all heaven move towards beseeching souls? No matter, why. So it is, and that is enough. And it is enough for me to know that somehow my waiting mind there in my study is universally advertised, and excites a universal good will towards me, so that my windows are filled with in-flocking thoughts, according (I am compelled to say) to the size, and what not, of my mind." Sometimes these thoughts will come sparsely and slowly. But come as they may, he puts them down great and small, so long as they come. He

insists upon original effort, upon the mind doing its best to get materials for the sermon before reading on the subject. Then let the preacher freely consult commentaries and other books bearing on the topic.

Having topic and materials, he next proceeds to organize these materials according to the proper end in view—the salvation of men—rejecting whatever will not fall into line toward this end.

As to “how plainly a preacher had better show to his congregation the skeleton in his sermons,” the author says, “as a rule, just about as plainly as he shows his own skeleton.” But he adds, “If there should ever come up a serious doubt among a people whether their minister has any skeleton, he had better show one,” and “perhaps preachers do well to show their skeletons often enough to create a general feeling that they always have them.” Now all such talk as this against the exhibition of “skeletons” in sermons comes largely, we think, from the word used, rather than from the idea. A planless mass of material is as monstrous in a sermon as in a building. And if a plan is necessary to a well-ordered sermon, why may it not be seen whenever its prominence will increase the power of a sermon, just as the distinct and well-rounded limbs of a human body serve to render it more effective. Indeed we are inclined to think that the absence of a clearly defined plan and unity is a defect in some of the excellent sermons in this volume, of which the author himself seems in some cases to be aware. In closing his discourse on The Transit of Venus, from the text, “The heavens declare the glory of the Lord,” he says, “Brethren, I feel that there is less than my usual unity in the

remarks which I have made this morning. But I have this to comfort me, that many times, in discourses of the utmost unity, the good gained by different persons listening comes from single sentences and single thoughts that are no essential part of the substance and general movement of the discourse. I would not make that an argument for a scattering and unorganized treatment of subjects; but only a solace when, for any reason, one happens to fall into scattering."

As regards what the author calls "the amplification" or development of the outlined sermon, he thinks that it should come mainly from "the amplification of the man,"—constantly increasing with all the experience and observation of years. "A great man makes a great sermon, and O! what clear effects of greatness are made now and then by quite measurable and even moderate men, who have turned their powers into the service of God with a complete consecration, and have opened themselves to the infloodings of his blessed Spirit."

While these thoughts of the author on making sermons are found substantially in some works on Homiletics, they are especially valuable as the results of his own experience.

As an aid to originality in the preacher, he would have him think more than he reads, and have him "read reflectively, critically, ruminatively, judicially," using freely outside material, but making it all his own.

In his two lectures on Imagination in Ministers, and Imagination in Sermons, the author lays much stress on cultivating the imagination both recollective and creative, as an aid to the proper setting forth of Biblical doctrines

historically, to the seeing of doctrines in their comparative importance, and to the interpretation of the imaginative parts of the Bible. The imagination should also be cultivated because of its beneficial influence on the language of the pulpit, and its "prolific contribution of images and imageries drawn from life and from Nature."

In the lecture on Short Sermons, Dr. Burton well defines a short sermon as "a sermon that seems short." "Time has nothing to do with it." Among the causes that make a sermon seem long, are named a monotonous voice, giving "a sense of eternity," monotonous thought, slow progress through the subject, too much proving of things, long introductions, and lack of substance, which last fault can be remedied only by hard work. A slow utterance will make a sermon seem long, as will also the appearance of preaching mainly to unfold a subject instead of impressing hearers, and the preaching on a theme and in a manner far away from the customary thinking and the daily life of the mass.

His three positive rules for making a sermon short are, first, "to stop" the sermon when through with the thought. If necessary, "Strike it by lightning." Secondly, choose just one thought and resolve to stop when it is developed and applied. And then do not crowd into the sermon everything that belongs to that one thought, for you may speak again on that subject some day.

In the lecture on Order in Sermon Topics, Dr. Burton recommends that preachers, in selecting their themes for Sunday mornings, follow the recorded career of the Lord, or "the order of the Christian Year as laid down in the liturgies of the Church at large." This he thinks

would make their preaching full of Christ, would make it sweep the entire circle of Christian truth in both the Old Testament and the New, and would keep them from getting into ruts in their preaching. For the second sermon on each Sunday, he would have the pastor select his subject from a wider range of topics as the occasion might demand.

On the Assimilation of Sermon Material, the author has given so many valuable suggestions that this lecture deserves to stand beside Professor Shedd's excellent lecture on General Maxims for Sermonizing. While the preacher is to be on the alert to gather materials of thought and illustration for his sermons from every source, especially from the Bible, he is to make them all his own by patient, earnest meditation, and putting to practical use.

As regards variety in church service, Dr. Burton thinks "it is best that our services should call for quite a little change of posture as they move on," and that they should not be made monotonous by "a strong push for unity," since unity is not incompatible with variety. He would have preachers aim at variety both in their themes for sermons and in the way of treating them, as also in their prayers and hymns.

We regard these Yale Lectures on preaching by Dr. Burton as among the best of the excellent courses of lectures on this subject, delivered in the Divinity School of Yale University. They are full of valuable thoughts and suggestions, set forth in the freshest manner, with abundant and striking illustrations. In his use of language the author seems to have no fear of Webster or Worcester

before his eyes, but goes on in a marvelous way, turning nouns into verbs, participles, and the like, at pleasure.

In respect to the Sermons contained in this volume, we think that, while they are highly characteristic of their author, and permeated with his genius and spirit, they are not, perhaps, as a whole, such as he himself might have selected from his many able discourses. We hope that, as intimated in the Preface, one or more volumes of his sermons may soon be given to the public.

THE VOCATION OF THE PREACHER.¹

This last work from the industrious pen of its late author, consists of more than five hundred pages of interesting matter on preaching and preachers. The volume is characteristic of the writer. It contains much instructive information, respecting both the matter and manner of preaching, and interesting descriptions of several noted preachers, some of them of the olden time.

The preacher's vocation the author defines as "the instinct for souls," . . . "an instinct which has wrought in some men, and in some ages, like a passion, which was the passion of Jesus, the passion of Paul, and which has been the passion of many of the more wonderful of the humbly obscure men, who lived, and died, and made no sign which the great world regarded; but who, nevertheless, felt that wonderful instinct, the instinct for souls." The model of the preacher's vocation is in the Book which is to be to him "text, doctrine, creed, life, inspiration, consolation, history, biography,—everything."

¹ *The Vocation of the Preacher.* By E. Paxton Hood. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1888.

The imagination the author regards as of great value to the preacher. Although no faculty in the pulpit has been more abused, there is perhaps none that, when properly cultivated, can be made more useful.

As to the use of "paper in the pulpit," the author well says that "slavish reading can never be true preaching." But though he asserts that "Paper is certainly a non-conductor in the pulpit, and interferes with the dynamic power of the word," yet he admits that "It does not follow because a man reads that he should not be an orator, that he should not feel, and deeply feel himself, and also take captive the feelings of his audience." It is certain, he says, that Chrysostom, Augustine, and Gregory the Great, did not disdain the assistance of paper in the pulpit. Neither did Baxter nor our own Edwards. It is the man, whether with or without paper, that makes the preacher.

In his chapter on Billingsgate in the Pulpit, the author regards Robert South, whose "style is held up to admiration," as the "Tom Sayers of the pulpit." He puts him at the unenviable head of the list of ministers whose coarse style of preaching has disgraced the pulpit.

As regards the place of the pulpit in poetry and fiction, the author thinks that preachers may learn many good lessons from a careful reading of the numerous and often exaggerated portrayals of themselves and their faults in fiction and poetry. "Preachers should study fiction if they would learn how to preach." Among several other graphic descriptions of ministerial character and life, from such writers as Lytton, Hugo, Scott, Mrs. Stowe, Tennyson, and Whittier, the author refers to the "sweet deline-

ation of American ministerial life," given in the description of Parson Hawkins' trouble, in Mr. Aldrich's "Prudence Palfrey." The pathetic story calls forth from the writer a remark so truthful and well put, that we cannot forbear to give it to our readers. "This is a suggestive little portrait, but we should not have thought it so applicable to the state of society in America as to that of our country; with us, it is simply true that the age which is supposed to give ripe wisdom and experience to other professions, when, in the army, men are looking for highest promotion, when the accomplished lawyer expects to exchange the bar for the bench, when, in our English episcopate, the clergyman expects to be raised to the rank of bishop, the age of maturity, of wisdom, of fruitful learning, this is the age when the Congregational clergyman is cast out as a dry tree! And this is one of the circumstances which will always depreciate the pulpit, the fact that the old age of the minister is delivered over to years of which he says, 'There is no pleasure in them.'"

Among the foregoing topics the author has interspersed sketches and critical estimates of noted preachers, as illustrations of his views; such as F. W. Faber, styled by the author, the Preacher of the Oratory and the Cloister, at once poet and preacher; John Henry Newman, "eminently a preacher for preachers," and regarded by the author "as the greatest preacher of our age;" Edward Andrews of Walworth, "endowed with all the most eminent attractions of genius," resembling in many respects Hartley Coleridge, and pre-eminently the "poet of the pulpit;" James Parsons of York, "the English Massillon," who of all preachers of his time in England "would," the

author thinks, "have met the most universal award of pre-eminence in the pulpit;" the "Puritan" Thomas Adams, "the George Herbert of the pulpit;" and John Elias and Christmas Evans, who stood notably at the head of "the preachers of wild Wales."

This volume, though somewhat diffuse in thought and style, and deficient in unity, is interesting and suggestive, and is worth reading.

JOHN WARD, PREACHER.¹

One of the characteristics of the evangelical pulpit of to-day contrasted with that of a half century ago, is its treatment of the doctrine of eternal punishment. In many pulpits this subject is rarely discussed, in others a general reticence in regard to it is maintained. Probably this is owing not so much to a growing disbelief in the doctrine on the part of the evangelical ministry, as to a somewhat prevalent doubt in the minds of the people as to the truth of the doctrine. This doubt, often arising to positive disbelief, shows itself in many forms of the literature of the day. It has especially cropped out in two or three of the so-called religious novels of the last year, in which the doctrine of endless perdition or an eternal hell, is set forth in such terms of exaggeration as to make it a caricature. This, Mrs. Deland has done in her volume whose title stands at the head of this notice. The two clergymen whom she introduces to us in her book, represent, we cannot but think, two greatly exaggerated types of belief among evangelical ministers. Dr. Howe, an Episcopal

¹ *John Ward, Preacher.* By Margaret Deland. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1888.

rector, believes, as he says, in a hell, but would never think of preaching it; while John Ward, Preacher, a Presbyterian pastor, believes so fully in "eternal damnation" that he feels in duty bound not only to preach it very often and sternly, but also to compel his young wife,—a bride of one year, and whom he dearly loves,—to believe it or to wear out her life in dreary exile from his home. The description of the belief and preaching of these two ministers is so overdrawn as to appear ridiculous. We think that there are few, if any, among the Episcopal clergy of the United States, who believe one thing and preach another, or else do not preach it at all, while we are equally confident that there are very few, if any, Presbyterian ministers who harp on the doctrine of eternal punishment Sunday after Sunday. And yet we cannot but think that there is a slight groundwork of truth upon which the volume is based. Certainly it is true that what are termed the severer doctrines of the Scriptures are rarely discussed in evangelical pulpits. They are taken for granted, and often indirectly referred to, and are made the basis of tender appeal and entreaty, though they rarely form the subject of discourse. Perhaps the absence of deep conviction of the enormity of sin and of its desert of punishment, is the chief cause for this reticence of the pulpit. But whenever the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the unrepentant sinner is preached, it should be in the tender and loving spirit in which our Lord himself preached it. Preached it should be, we believe, by him who would declare "the whole counsel of God," and thus be "pure from the blood of all men."

EVANGELISTIC WORK.¹

Probably few men in the American churches are as well fitted to write a volume on the world's evangelization as is Dr. Pierson. He modestly says in his Preface, that "a close study of the theme for twenty years, in circumstances providentially very helpful, has thrown some light upon the matter; and experience, that, like lamps at the ship's stern, illuminates the path which has been traversed, throws at least a dim ray over the onward course."

The volume is divided into two parts, the first setting forth in twelve chapters, Evangelistic Work in Theory; and the second, in as many chapters, Evangelistic Work in Practice. The evangelistic problem is how to execute our Lord's last command—"Go, make disciples of all nations"—with promptness, persistence and power. As regards the factors which enter into this problem, the author estimates that there are at least seven hundred and fifty millions of mankind that have no knowledge of a crucified Christ; that they can never be evangelized by the present *inadequate supply of laborers*; that the *opportunity of evangelization* is practically limited to the lifetime of each generation; that *all accessions to the churches* by conversion do not represent actual growth, which for the last half century has been only about seven converts yearly to every one hundred church members; and, worse still, the *church itself lacks piety and therefore power*.

The Scriptural solution of this great problem is, the author maintains, the teaching of our Lord, that makes emphatic the duty and privilege of every saved soul to be-

¹ *Evangelistic Work in Principle and Practice.* By Arthur T. Pierson, D.D. New York: The Baker and Taylor Co.

come a saver of others. This is the general tone and tendency of all his words. The method of evangelization is to be by preaching, teaching and testifying. "All are to go, and to go to all." There must then be evangelistic work by the whole Church, and there must be evangelistic power from the Holy Ghost. The early Christians illustrated this spirit and method, and went everywhere preaching the word with remarkable results. To this primitive method the whole body of Christians must return to-day. Yet it must be confessed that the great majority of professing Christians practically do nothing whatever in discipling others. If they could be persuaded to take up this work, they would find at once great joy in it, and great blessing to their spiritual life.

The central theme of all successful evangelism is "Christ Crucified." "*There will*," the author maintains, "*be no marked advance in evangelistic work, without more emphatic and exclusive preaching of Christ crucified.*" Many of the themes treated in the modern pulpit "are travesties upon preaching." The true sermon has its genesis in the divine word, which it develops with the purpose of setting forth Christ as the power of God unto salvation.

Here the question arises: How shall evangelistic preaching be made at once attractive and effective? Dr. Pierson answers that it must be the unfolding of a Scripture *germ*, and take largely even a Scripture *form*; that it must have simplicity in thought and word; and that the preacher must be invested with a mysterious power known as *unction*, and must be oblivious of *self*.

This kind of preaching, he affirms, is utterly at variance with "The Secular Spirit" of the pulpit that causes

it to make a constant effort to robe the gospel in worldly charms in order to attract worldly men to the Church, and to appeal so far to the aesthetic taste in the service of song as to displace the divine savor and flavor of worship. “If the Church would woo and win souls, it must be by offering them attractions and satisfactions which the world does not and cannot offer,—that which is bread and satisfies spiritual hunger, instead of husks which fill but do not feed; the well of water springing up into everlasting life, instead of the broken cistern.” Facts would seem to prove that as a result of the modern secularization of the churches, the common people are deserting them. The late Earl of Shaftesbury said that “*not more than two per cent* of workingmen in England are wont to attend public worship.” In the United States, the author thinks “that the bulk of our population, especially in the cities, is practically as unreached by the gospel as the masses of pagans are in the heart of Africa.” In Berlin, according to Professor Christlieb, only two per cent of the whole population attend divine service, and he adds that “In no Christian country are things so bad as in Germany.”

Among the subordinate helps to evangelistic work, the author ranks first of all the *evangelistic service*, whose special object is the conversion of men. He would have it held as a Sunday evening service, with an “after-meeting” for the immediate application of the truth to individuals. He would also have sung at these meetings evangelistic hymns, setting forth the central truths of the gospel.

In the second part of his book, Dr. Pierson gives a graphic sketch of the life and work of such representative

evangelists as Whitefield, Finney, Spurgeon, Moody, and McAll.

The volume, as a whole, is a valuable aid to the practical solution of the evangelistic problem.

MODERN CITIES AND THEIR RELIGIOUS PROBLEMS.¹

Into this little volume, Rev. Samuel Lane Loomis has condensed within seven chapters much valuable information and experience on the evangelization of cities. He agrees, in the main, with Dr. Pierson as to the means to be employed. His Suggestions regarding Christian Work for our Cities, in his last chapter, are worthy of special attention.

He thinks that if the churches would reach the people, they must greatly enlarge their working force in the towns and cities,—must employ not only their pastors, but, like the English churches, missionaries, Bible-readers, deaconesses, and trained nurses. If they are to reach workingmen, they must be assisted by workingmen. He would have a “down-town church” not hasten away to the suburbs, but manfully hold its ground, and have other churches in the city and suburbs rally to its support. Religious services should be frequent, at which should be preached plain gospel truth, accompanied with the singing of popular gospel songs.

The author thinks the parish system, if it could be adopted, would prove far more efficient than the present

¹ *Modern Cities and Their Religious Problems.* By Samuel Lane Loomis. With an Introduction by Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D., New York : The Baker and Taylor Company.

weak “plan of attraction,” and deplores the sad fact that “The forces of the kingdom of heaven are scattered and divided between a score or more of rival sects, no one of which will allow to another exclusive right to any portion of territory, no matter how little it may be doing there itself.”

He pleads also for the cultivation in the churches of a broader, truer, and more profoundly Christian sympathy with workingmen, than that now felt—a sympathy which shall show itself in deeds as well as in words, and which shall win the hearts of the masses and lead them to Christ.

CHAPTER II.

PRACTICAL HOMILETICS—SERMONS.

ETERNAL ATONEMENT.¹

The Rev. Dr. Roswell Dwight Hitchcock, late President and Washburn Professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary, destroyed the greater part of his sermons a few years before his lamented death. Of the thirty that he spared, nineteen have been published under the above title since his decease. They are mostly on practical themes, in the treatment of which the preacher rarely uses argument, but appeals to the convictions and consciences of his hearers.

His introductions, always appropriate, are in some cases very felicitous. Often they are descriptive, and introduce the subject in a very graphic manner. In the discourse entitled, "From Blindness to Vision," from the text John ix, 39: "And Jesus said, For judgment came I into this world that they who see not may see, and that they who see may become blind," we have the following: "Milton was forty-six years old when he became blind, carrying with him into that blindness of twenty years, endless galleries of remembered visions: vivid pictures of

¹ *Eternal Atonement*. By Roswell Dwight Hitchcock, D.D., LL.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888.

land and sea and sky, of golden days and starry nights, of storm and calm, of wife and children. But this poor blind man of Jerusalem, in the ninth chapter of John's Gospel was born blind. All his life he had never once seen his mother's face. Now all at once he sees his mother's face, sees his father, whom very likely he less cared to see, sees the neighbors who had been in the habit of speaking kindly to him in the street, sees the grand new Temple of Herod of which he had heard so much, sees the slope of Olivet dotted over with trees, sees the bright blue sky, sees the singing birds. Look at him going about with a new kind of springy movement, stopping every now and then to gaze, and to gaze again. You and I will never know just how glad and grateful that man was. Jesus had cured a great many blind people in Galilee, in Judea, in Decapolis, people that had become blind in that scorching climate; but never before had he cured any one born blind. That was a very great miracle, from natural, born blindness, to instant and perfect vision. But underneath it there was another miracle, far greater, from spiritual blindness to spiritual vision: of which I propose to speak to-day."

The author generally states his subjects clearly and briefly, makes few and prominent divisions, and develops his thought by clear statement, apt illustration, and direct appeal, rather than by argumentation. His conclusions are brief, tender and pointed.

The style of these sermons is admirable. The words are mainly simple and forcible, the sentences short, and the thoughts vividly expressed. Perhaps the style is too uniformly brilliant. Metaphors, often striking, are used

in abundance ; similes, rarely. The author is a master in graphic delineation.

These sermons are filled to repletion with evangelical truth, and set forth with great power the chief doctrines of the Bible. In a "Charge to an Evangelist,"¹ is the following : "It may sound strangely, but I must say it, the great weakness of the ministry in our day comes from its neglect of the Bible. It is not half enough studied, pondered over, prayed over. Our texts are too often only mottoes. Our sermons are not saturated, as they should be, with the Scriptures. What we need is vastly more of Bible truth, in the Bible forms. My brother, be a man of this one great Book. Plunge your intellect into its depths. Send your emotions up into its heights. Let your preaching come out of it, as at Horeb waters gushed from the smitten rock. So shall you be God's ambassador, speaking only God's word. And so shall you save both yourself and them that hear you."

We are struck with the manly and robust Christian character that shines through these discourses. It is a cause of regret that the lamented author did not spare from the flames the materials for another volume of sermons like this. With his impressive delivery, we can easily imagine the effect produced by these discourses as they came from his lips.

FIFTEEN YEARS IN THE CHAPEL OF YALE COLLEGE.²

The distinguished author tells us in his Preface that "The discourses in this volume were prepared for definite

¹ Rev. Edward P. Hammond.

² *Fifteen Years in the Chapel of Yale College.* By Noah Porter
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888.

academic uses, and written in a distinctively academic spirit. Fifteen of them were delivered as Baccalaureate sermons before the classes which were graduated during the presidency of the writer. The remaining three have some historic interest. While their themes are practical, the treatment of them is more or less philosophical."

The first sermon in the volume, *On Leaving the Old Chapel*, from the text, "We have thought of thy loving kindness, O God, in the midst of thy temple," is a very appropriate discourse filled with tender reminiscences to the older graduates of Yale.

If these discourses seem somewhat too uniformly polemic and apologetic in their tone, the author in his sermon, *On Entering the New Chapel*, sets forth the reason in his fine description of his ideal college preacher. "But the college preacher should be sensitively alive to all the tendencies of modern speculation. No electrometer should respond more quickly than he to the changing moods of the thinking of the times. He should anticipate as by instinct each new position for attack or defence which is taken by the unbelief of cultivated men. Being himself a man of culture, and thoroughly acknowledging it in all its forms as the rich and becoming fruitage of the kingdom of God, he should assert for faith itself a royal pre-eminence, and set forth its claims by arguments which command respect, and compel conviction." It should also be remembered that these discourses were delivered through nearly a score of years to largely different audiences of young men of culture, fully alive to prevalent theologic doubts and difficulties.

One of the first things that strikes us in reading these

discourses is the richness and abundance of the material of which they are composed. Into them are garnered the fruits of a life-time of wide reading and thinking. The learned author could hardly have fitted himself better for this service, had he directed all his reading and study to this one end. In philosophy, logic and literature, he seems in these discourses to be equally at home, and employs them all to throw a flood of light upon his themes. In this respect he realizes the description given by a writer in Tacitus, "The knowledge which we have of many departments of learning, adorns us even when discussing a subject not included in these branches, and where you would least think it, shines out and becomes evident."

He has the rare faculty in a preacher of entering very fully into sympathy with hearers perplexed with religious doubts and difficulties, and thus leading them out into assured conviction. In treating objections he is a model of candor. His illustrations, often very appropriate and telling, are largely drawn from literature.

The introductions of these discourses of Ex-President Porter, are replete with interesting thoughts, that lead naturally to their respective themes, which are usually announced in clear and brief terms. The plans of these sermons seem, in the main, excellent, but in a few cases it were to be wished that the divisions were more clearly marked, and more tersely stated.

The development of the themes is largely argumentative, and is very able. Here the preacher is at his best. His varied learning, ripe culture, and intimate knowledge of the different schools of theologic thought, together with his hearty sympathy with young and gifted minds strug-

gling with doubts, peculiarly fitted him for the discussion of the subjects to which he addressed himself.

The conclusions of these discourses, in which the truths discussed are affectionately commended to the thoughtful consideration of the "Young Gentlemen of the Graduating Class," are direct and searching.

We would designate as among the ablest of these discourses, the fourth, on Christ a Witness to the Truth; the fifth, on the Conquest over the World; the sixth, on Obedience the Condition of Knowledge; the seventh, on Christianity an Ethical Force; the eleventh, on The New and Old Commandment; the twelfth, on Agnosticism a Doctrine of Despair; the fourteenth, on The Evil Heart of Unbelief; the seventeenth, on Success in Life; and the eighteenth, on The Christian College.

The discourses in this volume are an honor to their author, and to the University over which he presided.

GOSPEL SERMONS.¹

The title given by Ex-President McCosh to his volume of sermons fitly characterizes them. They are full of the marrow of the gospel. Their distinguished author says of them, "Of the many discourses which I have delivered in Scotland, in Ulster, and to the students in Princeton College, I have selected those in which I have been enabled to proclaim most clearly the way of salvation." Hence these sermons fairly represent Dr. McCosh's type of preaching. They are the farthest possible from contain-

¹ *Gospel Sermons.* By James McCosh, D. D., LL.D., Litt. D. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers.

ing any display of philosophy. "I am anxious," he says, "that the public should know that, much as I value philosophy, I place the gospel of Jesus Christ above it." He might truthfully have added with the Apostle, "My speech and my preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom."

The eighteen discourses of the volume are eminently direct and practical. Five of them are descriptive or illustrative, on such themes as The Syro-Phenician Woman; Christian Humility illustrated in the Character of Paul; The Sifting of Peter; Growth in Grace illustrated in the Life of Nicodemus; Moses' Dying Reflections on Mt. Pisgah. In this species of sermons, Dr. McCosh particularly excels. The interest of the hearer or reader increases as the graphic portrayal of the character, motives and actions goes forward, until abiding impressions are made by the lessons inculcated.

The plans of several of the sermons are textual, of which the divisions are natural and prominent. Perhaps the method of division throughout these discourses is somewhat too uniform; and in two or three cases the plan includes more material than there is in the text. (Sermons i., ix.)

In the development of his themes the author mainly addresses the reason and the conscience, shows large knowledge of human nature, avoids philosophical speculations, and makes constant appeal to the Word of God. The illustrations employed are largely drawn from Scripture. Indeed, these sermons are permeated throughout with Biblical truth. In this respect they are fine examples of the opposite of a kind of preaching that the author condemns

in a passage which, though lengthy, we cannot forbear to quote: “We further see what is the style of preaching most fitted to advance the kingdom of God. It is preaching founded on Scripture, that speaks of Christ, and speaks to all,—to rich and poor, to Greek and barbarian, to old and young. There is a kind of preaching which sprang up in New England, an age or two ago, and which has since travelled South and West, but which does not seem to me the best for alluring the great body of the people. The minister is a well-educated, thinking man, and he reads and ponders the most of the week, and he brings out to his people his cogitations on the Lord’s Day. All well; I say the good householder must bring out of his treasure things new and old: his people will not thank him for throwing them what has cost him nothing. But then he brings out his own thoughts, ingenious it may be, but wire-drawn and abstruse, instead of God’s Word, to which they are pinned, and from which, certainly, they do not grow. They are admired excessively by a select number of refined men and women, who are loud in praise of the preacher, and offer him a constant incense of adulation. But as to our children, who compose, or at least ought to compose, so large a proportion of every congregation, as to our servants, male and female, our mechanics and day-laborers who have toiled all the week, they would feel an interest in the grand old truths of God scripturally and feelingly illustrated; but as to the peculiar notions or nostrums of this man’s brain, they cannot understand them, or at least they do not appreciate them, and in most cases they do not, thereby, suffer much loss. If this style prevails among those churches that require a highly educated

ministry, I fear the common people will turn to those churches where Scripture truth is preached more freely and heartily. There is an affected originality about this kind of preaching, which, however, consists more in a peculiarity of mode than in substance or reality. I admit that Christ is commonly there, but he is disguised by so many ingenious adjunets that a large body of the people do not see him."

The applications of the truth Dr. McCosh usually makes as he advances in the discussion of the different heads of the discourse. They are direct and searching.

These discourses are worthy of their author, and of the Christian pulpit.

EXPOSITIONS.¹

In his Preface to these Expositions, Dr. Cox says, "This, I think, must be the *biographical* volume of the Series." He adds what must seem strange to American ministers:—"And so many clergymen have written to tell me that they use my sermons in their pulpits, and find that those which are complete in themselves best serve their turn, that I have excluded a long series which I had prepared, and have replaced it with discourses more suitable for their purpose." It is to be hoped that the time is far distant when, among our churches, a pastor can look his people in the face while he preaches to them another man's sermon as his own.

These expository discourses are mostly upon the obscure characters of the Scriptures, such as Simeon, The

¹ *Expositions.* By the Rev. Samuel Cox, D. D. (St. Andrew's. Fourth Series. New York : Thomas Whittaker, 1888.

Cleansing of the Leper, the Man who was born Blind, Demetrius, Diotrephe, and Gaius.

These discourses are characterized by those qualities that have won for their learned author distinction as an exegete. They are, as was said of former discourses by the same author,¹ remarkably fresh and interesting in both matter and manner, and show that expository sermons may be made attractive as well as instructive. They are the fruit of ripe Biblical scholarship, keen perception, and fine analytical ability.

The author sets forth his views with frankness and manliness, and when we cannot agree with him, as in his frequent intimations of his belief in "The Larger Hope," we respect his modesty, sincerity and learning.

SERMONS PREACHED IN ST. GEORGE'S.²

The sixteen discourses contained in this volume are mostly on the practical themes of the times. These are discussed in an impartial, frank, and manly way, and the author shows that he is in hearty sympathy with those who are trying to solve the great problems which confront the Church to-day.

In his discourses on Inspiration for To-day, and Capital and Labor, after referring to the two great crises in the history of the Church, through which it has been triumphantly led,—in the first centuries the solving of the question as to the unity and the nature of God, the theological problem, and in the Reformation period the solving of the

¹ *Current Discussions in Theology.* 1886. P. 296.

² *Sermons Preached in St. George's.* By W. S. Rainsford. New York : Dodd, Mead and Company, 1887.

soteriological problem,—the author maintains that the third great crisis which confronts the Church is the solving of the sociological problem of man's relation to his fellow man. “Not until men learn that they are here to live, to work, to suffer, for others, can society approach its possible stage of development”

The author well points out the part which the pulpit should take in the attempt to solve this great problem. “The office of the pulpit is not to give men precepts: it is not to try to reproduce in other minds the mere reflection of one's own, but rather to help men to a truer apprehension of those eternal principles which each man must shape into his own life. It is not for us to enter into detailed explanations, either to workingmen or to capitalists, as to how each should treat the other; but it is our duty to remember, that while the opinions and actions of both laboring-men and capitalists are, of necessity, influenced by their surroundings and interests, the Christian clergy of this land are called of God in His Providence to occupy a position, of necessity, from which an unprejudiced and judicial view of the positions of these parties to each other should be easily obtainable. Our interests are with neither party specially, but with both; and to us, both must naturally look for wise and cool-headed counsel.”

In his sermon on Foreign Missions, the author presents many stirring thoughts in ringing words; and in his discourse on the Christian Sabbath, he sets forth very forcible arguments to the most “overworked race” that has ever been on the earth, for the proper observance of the Lord's day.

In his exegesis the author is sometimes at fault, as in the sermon on Quickened Life, from Rom. viii, 19, "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestations of the sons of God ;" in which the word translated "creature" is made to include man, in which interpretation he is at variance with Meyer and Alford.

The materials of these sermons are better than the forms in which they are cast. The subjects are not always stated with sufficient prominence, clearness and brevity, and this is also true of the main divisions. It is doubtful, to say the least, whether anything is gained by the attempt to change a sacred oration into the form of an essay.

SERMONS FOR CHILDREN.¹

We fancy that we have read these sixty-two short sermons of Dr. Ross with as much interest and pleasure as they were heard by the fortunate children of his congregation. They are the farthest possible from the talks—sometimes called sermons—largely made up of a string of tame stories, to which some children are compelled to listen. "The sermons," as the author tells us, "have aimed at plain and practical instruction, and not at sensational results. Hence they have not been highly wrought, or embellished with stories that seldom benefit hearers."

They are on the most practical of themes, as, Aiming at High Things; Making the Most of School; Making

¹ *Sermons for Children.* By A. Hastings Ross, pastor of the First Congregational Church of Port Huron, Michigan. Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society. 1887.

the Best of Everything; Cruelty; The Right Use of Money; Pure Hearts, Pure Words; The Duty of Prayer; A Mocking and a Brawler; How to Become a Christian; The Boy Samuel; Be Honest; Mine and Thine—or, Stealing; Profane Swearing; Telling Lies; Daniel, the Temperance Boy; The Unruly Tongue; and the like. These topics are all treated in a natural, simple and orderly way, with excellent sense and judgment, with sufficient illustrations drawn from the common events in children's lives, and in language which the youngest child present could hardly have failed to understand.

It is a good sign of the times that the pulpit is coming more and more to acknowledge that the children of a congregation have rights that it is bound to respect, that they have moral and spiritual needs for which it is under obligation to provide. How this can be done best is a problem that each pastor must solve for himself. Whether he shall employ the method recommended by the Rev. Dr. John Hall, of introducing here and there in his morning discourse, thoughts and illustrations adapted to the children scattered throughout the congregation, or shall take this method of Dr. Ross, and preach a five-minutes sermon to the children before delivering the usual discourse, "with a short hymn between the two," will of course depend largely upon what he finds he can do best.

We regard this volume of *Sermons for Children* as a valuable contribution to this rapidly increasing species of pulpit literature.

SPIRIT AND LIFE.¹

In his Preface to this volume of twelve sermons, Dr. Bradford modestly says: "Without attempting any orderly discussion of dogmatic themes, I have brought together here a few of the results of a pastor's practical labor, and offer in these discourses something of what a patient study of God's word and a reverent scrutiny of his works—"the two revelations"—have suggested to me concerning the Spirit and the Life. The fact that these partial views of truth have helped many in a narrow field to more satisfying conceptions of God, and to a more constant reliance on his Spirit in their search for truth, and in their attempt to face bravely the conflict and mystery of life, is the only excuse for offering them to an audience which may be larger and may be smaller."

Of these discourses, four are on the Holy Spirit, viz.: The Holy Spirit the Fundamental Doctrine of Christianity; The Holy Spirit in Individual Experience; The Holy Spirit and Christian Work; The Holy Spirit a Constant Factor in the Problem of Progress; the others are on Conditions of Spiritual Light; Theological Thought of Our Time; The Incarnation; The Vicarious Principle in the Universe; The Appeal to Experience; The Life, the Light of Men; The Invisible Realm; and The Endless Growth.

One of the first impressions made upon us in reading these sermons is the fresh and informal manner in which the author treats the subjects under consideration. He

¹ *Spirit and Life: Thoughts for To-Day.* By Amory H. Bradford, D.D. New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert. 1888.

sometimes goes so far in this direction, that he does not give sufficient distinctness either to his themes or to his divisions.

A careful reader of these discourses will also be impressed with the reverent spirit manifested by their author, and his evident desire to get at the truth in the topics discussed. We are charmed with his catholic and charitable spirit, while we may not be able to agree with him in some of his views.

We can hardly assent to the following thought in his discourse on The Incarnation : “With all reverence it may be said that there would have been an incarnation if there had been no sin. It was a necessity to the nature of God. . . . If it (sin) had not existed, God would have been the same and his richest gift would not have been withheld.”

In the sermon on The Vicarious Principle in the Universe, Dr. Bradford holds substantially the views of Dr. Bushnell, as opposed to what is termed the substitutional theory of the atonement.

These discourses exalt the Holy Spirit in his gracious offices and work, and delightfully set forth the Lord Jesus Christ as the central sun of the moral universe. Evidently their author has tried to embody in them his own ideal :—“Jesus Christ, the ever-satisfying answer of God to the everlasting hunger of the human heart,—this has been the message of the pulpit in the past; and to proclaim the same old truth in form adapted to the circumstances and to the natures of those who may listen in the future is all the honor that any man need court on the earth.”

THE VICTORY OF THE CROSS.¹

Whatever work Canon Westcott may give to the press is sure to be eagerly read by scholars. This volume of six sermons preached during Holy Week in Hereford Cathedral will, we are confident, interest and instruct its many readers. "In the following sermons," says the eminent author, "I have endeavored to give an outline of the view of the Atonement which frequent study has led me to regard with more and more confidence as both Scriptural and, in the highest sense of the word, natural, since I had first occasion to work at the subject in 1858." He acknowledges valuable suggestions from Dr. Campbell's and Dr. Dale's Essays on the Atonement, and from Dr. Mulford's *Republic of God*. He approaches the subject "in a devotional rather than in a scholastic form," presenting it "as a fruitful subject for quiet meditation," in the conviction "that the Victory of the Cross is revealed to us with fresh glory by thoughts which are characteristic of our own age."

At the opening of the first sermon, he sets forth the general object of the sermons. "I desire to consider the problem of sin and suffering in connection with one characteristic thought of our own generation. I desire to show how Christianity interprets, completes, consecrates for daily use, that conception of the unity of humanity which the students of life and nature have brought home to us within our own memory: to show how the fundamental thought of the gospel that *the Word became flesh*

¹ *The Victory of the Cross: Sermons preached during Holy Week, 1888, in Hereford Cathedral.* By Brooks Foss Westcott, D. D., D. C. L. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1888.

gives a Divine foundation for our belief that duty is the law of the individual life, and solidarity the law of universal life, one law in two forms, fulfilled through the manifold sorrows which we dimly realize: to show, in other words, step by step, the possibility, the condition, the reality, the moving force, the assurance, the present realization of that perfection of manhood through suffering which Christ has wrought for us."

The author then proceeds to treat of The Natural Fellowship of Men, showing that the possibility of redemption is involved in this natural fellowship; that they are united and dependent on one another, materially, intellectually, socially, and spiritually; and that they have fellowship in failure, in sorrow, in sin, and cannot dwell apart.

In his second discourse on The Power of Sacrifice, the author aims to show that the condition of redemption is shown by nature in sacrifice; that the power of sacrifice—the central truth of Christianity—is confirmed by experience; that its necessity is based in our fellowship; and that its power is justified by personal and national experience. Sacrifice is welcomed by the conscience, and becomes to us a revelation of a larger life, of victorious influence, and of an eternal blessing. The teaching of nature on sacrifice thus agrees with Christ, which he himself fulfilled, that "Whosoever shall seek to gain his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life shall bring it to a new birth."

In his third sermon, on The Unity of Humanity in Christ, Dr. Westcott, taking for his text Gal. iii, 28, *There can be neither Jew nor Greek; there can be neither bond nor free; there can be no male and female; for ye are*

all one man in Christ Jesus, sets forth his aim in the following words: “In Christ, as I hope to show, that natural fellowship is raised to a Divine unity, so that the possibility of Redemption is made a fact: in Christ that fruitfulness grows infinite, so that the condition of redemption receives absolute satisfaction. To the Christian the solidarity of mankind is shown in the single sentence: *the Word became flesh.* All are “one man in Christ Jesus.” In this is revealed the purpose of creation. “We go back to the Divine words in the first chapter of the Bible *let us make man in our image after our likeness*—in our image to gain our likeness—that we may find the great charter of our hope.” The author says that “He (Christ) realized absolutely under the conditions of earth the Divine likeness which neither one man nor all men could reach. He gained for the race that for which they were made.” The life of Christ is a universal life in character and experience, a Divine life (because lived in God) which we are called to reveal. Hence Christians are a first fruits of creation.

The author, in his fourth sermon, on The Sufferings of Christ, from the text Heb. v, 8, (*Christ) though He was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered,* remarks that “we naturally think of the sufferings of Christ in relation to ourselves as a ransom, a propitiation, an atonement. This indeed they are; but Scripture teaches us to think of them also in relation to Christ Himself, Who was *made perfect through sufferings.*” “He endured in His Passion every penalty which the righteousness of God had connected with the sins which He made His own.” These sufferings of Christ “were complete,

they were voluntary, they were foreseen, they were understood in the fulness of their anguish and unnaturalness; and therefore they were the spring of perfectness."

The Virtue of Christ's Sacrifice—the theme of the fifth sermon of the series—is from the text, Heb. x, 8, 9, 10, *Saying above, Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein . . . then hath He said, Lo, I am come to do Thy will. . . In which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once for all.* The author, after noticing what he regards as imperfect or false theories of the atonement, gives us his own view: "Christ who took humanity to Himself was able to fulfil the will of God under the conditions of our present earthly life, both actively and passively, raising to its highest perfection every faculty of man, and bearing every suffering through which alone fallen man could attain his destiny." "Christ gathering the race into Himself suffered for all by the will of God." This thought he ably develops under these four heads:

"1. Christ exhausted all suffering, bearing it according to the will and mind of God.

2. We on our part need the constant support of His present sympathy in our labours.

3. Christ is able to communicate the virtue of His work, the reality of forgiveness, to all who are in Him.

4. We on our part can even now through every trial realize His joy."

Dr. Westcott takes as the text for the subject of his last discourse—Christ Reigning from the Cross—John xii, 32, *I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men*

unto myself. In treating this theme, he shows that the sovereignty of Christ from the cross is a new sovereignty —“The Divine King rules forever by dying,” that it is universal, is present, is divine—answering to the very nature of God, is exercised through His people, and is effective upon the heart and life.

In his résumé the author says, “We have seen, in a word, however imperfectly it must have been, that the Victory of the Cross is the satisfaction of the necessities, the instincts, the aspirations, the activities of the soul of man.”

These sermons with learned notes are full of fresh thoughts, and the topics are treated in a reverential manner, and in a delightful spirit. In homiletical structure they are orderly, clear and attractive. They will well repay reading, though the reader may now and then dissent from the views of their author.

THE WORLD TO COME.¹

This volume consists of twenty sermons and addresses, remarkably characteristic of their author. They are quite original in matter and far from conventional in form, and have in a marked degree the qualities of truthfulness, manliness, and “sweet reasonableness.” The themes treated are mostly of a practical nature. “In the selection of sermons,” says the author, “I have carefully avoided all which treat of questions in debate, and have chosen those which depend for such force as they have

¹ *The World to Come.* By William Burnet Wright. Boston and New York. Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1887.

upon principles acknowledged by the universal Christian conscience as true."

Hence in these discourses the author, avoiding all controversy, addresses himself to the illustration and enforcement of generally accepted truths. These he sets forth in a fresh manner and with affluent illustrations.

But we must think that he is at times a little lame in his exegesis. In his sermon on The Model Church, from the text, Acts ii, 43-47: "And fear came upon every soul, and many wonders and signs were done by the Apostles. And all that believed were together and had all things common;" etc., he says, "1. We are told that fear came upon every soul, that is, upon every member of the Church. So it seemed to Luke. . . . Luke describes this splendid bravery" (of the disciples after Pentecost) "by saying, 'Fear came upon every soul' which caught the fine contagion." . . . "These men were fearless, he explains, because they feared God." On the contrary Dean Howson interprets the verse thus: "*And fear came upon every soul.* The general impression on the public mind. A feeling of awe was excited even among those who did not join the company of believers." Meyer says, "Luke in these words describes what sort of impression the extraordinary result of the event of Pentecost made generally upon the minds of those who did not belong to the youthful church." So also Alford.

In the sermon on The Keys of the Kingdom, from Matt. xvi, 18, 19, the author says: "If we will give due weight to the obvious peculiarities of Peter's character, it will be evident that the words of the text were not intended to remind him of his strength, but to warn him of his weak-

ness." The object of the discourse is to set forth this view, which seems fanciful, and is at variance with Meyer's interpretation.

In the interesting discourse on Gideon's Men, from Judges vii, 7: "And the Lord said unto Gideon, By the three hundred men that lapped will I save you and deliver the Midianites into thine hand," the whole development is based on the fact that "the three hundred did not kneel upon the bank, but stood watching, and caught up the water in their hands, as if watching, and not drinking, were their business." Thus they were selected because they revealed by their manner of drinking some of the best soldierly qualities.

The memorial discourse on Franklin Snow is a very tender and beautiful tribute to a good man. The address on Christmas (which fitly closes the volume) is full of curious Christmas lore blended with delightful humor.

We have read this volume with pleasure and profit, and commend it to our readers.

PRESENT STATE
OF
STUDIES IN PASTORAL THEOLOGY.
BY
REV. G. B. WILLCOX,
PROFESSOR OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY AND SPECIAL STUDIES,
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE CHURCHES AND THE WORKINGMEN.

Dr. Lyman Abbott, in the *Homiletic Review* for November, 1888, discusses the question concerning what the Church owes to this class of our countrymen. Negatively, he holds that nothing is gained by turning the pulpit into a lecture-platform, or the Church into a lyceum. The preacher's duty is to preach Christ, not social theories or economic reforms. Nor should he preach to workingmen, or to any other class, as such. The class-jealousy is strong enough already. It is not the business of a Christian minister to emphasize and intensify it. In the least degree possible he should recognize it at all. A third duty on the positive side, is to make the church-services accessible to laboring men. It is often said that the rich in our churches have no supercilious feeling, that they would welcome the laboring classes to seats. But the question is, does this sympathy reach farther—does it go to the length of making any and all seats free to the first comers? St. George's church, New York, under the pastorate of Dr. Rainsford, has answered this question. For two years after he commenced his work in that church, the galleries were closed. There was not congregation enough to fill the body of the house. But he had insisted, as a condition of his acceptance of the call, that the pews should be free. He inaugurated a method of contribution to meet expenses, sent out visitors to invite in the common people

of the neighborhood, set the young men and young women of the church, who were employes, at Christian work, on a perfect equality with the wealthiest, made his church Sunday school and Mission Sunday school one, directed ushers to recognize no distinction between the foremost members of the church and the poorest strangers; and now the church is full, on floor and galleries, to its utmost capacity.

The mere abolition of pew-rents will not, as Dr. Abbot urges, suffice, in itself, to bring workingmen into the church. It is not the rents which are the barrier, but the spirit, of which, too often, they are the symbol. Workingmen are not excluded from Masonic lodges, or their sons from colleges. There is no caste-spirit thereallowed.

Moreover, when the workingmen attend church, they must find something there that meets their soul's want. It must be a gospel like that of the Master, dealing little in doctrinal abstractions, but much in the simple story of the Cross and of the applications of religion to daily life. The rich in the church and congregation need these applications. Says Dr. Abbott: "We cannot practice on the world's motto, 'Get all you can, and keep all you get,' on Monday, and expect to have the respect of the world for what we are pleased to call our religion. We cannot gamble in breadstuffs through the week, and preach industry to wage-earners on Sunday. We cannot practice high caste all the week, and preach the democracy of Christianity on Sunday. . . . There is no specific for the absence of workingmen from our churches and no better way to get them back, than to go to the four Gospels, see how Christ preached and lived in that epoch in which the poor had the gospel preached to them, and heard it gladly; and follow the example which He set."

LEGAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CLERGYMEN.

Rev. William Hull, of Hudson, N. Y., has, in *The Homiletic Review*, for May, 1888, a résumé of legal decisions affecting the privileges and liabilities of ministers.

The law protects their reputation. If they are slandered, the law requires only that the fact, not the injury resulting from the fact, shall be proved. On account of the importance of his good name to a clergymen, judges have assumed that a slander causes damage.

The law favors ministers as to taxation. In the State of New York they are exempted to the extent of \$1500 worth of property.

The law protects them in the discharge of their duties. Disturbing religious services is in all the States severely punished. Also, a clergymen cannot be compelled to divulge secrets confided to him in confidence by his flock. But we suspect that this last statement of Mr. Hull would require modification.

The law protects a clergymen's livelihood. Even where there has been no pecuniary contract with a parish, he can collect a reasonable remuneration for his service. The whole church property is liable for this. But the officers of neither church nor society can be individually held. If the minister, being under ecclesiastical censure, vainly appeals to some higher authority in his church, then his right to collect salary fails from the date of the original censure. The judges of the higher courts in Massachusetts have always held that, if no date were set by the parties in interest, for the termination of a pastorate, it is, *prima facie*, for life.

Though it goes without saying that the clergy, as a body, are a law-abiding class, they are as to this matter not altogether above criticism. Not only clerical adventurers, but men of character and standing are occasionally careless in solemnizing, without full inquiry, the marriage of minors and other unqualified parties. But more needs to be said on the score of the rights than of the responsibilities of clergymen. In some States of the Union, for example, the whole responsibility for unauthorized marriages is thrown on the officiating minister. No license from a town clerk or city registrar comes between him and the law. He must fill out a blank with a formidable list of inquiries, all wise and proper indeed, as to names, birthplaces, ages and occupations of the parties and their parents ; and, if he have the least reason to suspect that either groom or bride is a minor, misrepresenting the true age, he is strictly required to administer the oath. We remember an instance in New Jersey, in which a deacon sued his own pastor for marrying a daughter of the deacon (who had deliberately misstated her own age), securing \$200 damages. Evident good faith and intent on the part of the clergyman ought, in all reason, to be allowed to go far in his defense.

There are, too, cases not a few in which a pastor is cruelly defrauded by a parish. Public opinion and his own instincts forbid his entering legal suit for arrearages. There are trustees unprincipled enough to take advantage of this. They neglect just claims as they would not for a moment think of doing with a creditor disposed to legal measures.

It bears also, severely, against a clergyman, that a dif-

ferent standard of morality from that by which others are judged is erected for him. A merchant, compelled by reverses to take the benefit of a bankrupt-act, is counted unfortunate, not criminal. If, after legal release, he ever indemnifies his creditors, it is lauded as a remarkable instance of integrity. But the act of a clergyman, who should be forced to the same resort, would be counted unpardonable. Whether he ought to do it is not the question. But the inequality of tests or standards here is beyond dispute.

This exceptional moral standard for a clergyman has been sometimes an invitation to acts of blackmail. In some cases the innocent victim has been so intimidated, and so unwise, as, instead of prosecuting the conspirator at once, to the extent of the law, to pay a small sum as hush-money. This, of course, puts the foot into a trap from which it may be extricated only with infinite trouble, and at heavy cost.

THE PROBLEM OF THE COUNTRY CHURCH.

Two articles, on this matter, in *The Andover Review*, for September and October, 1888, by different writers, have much interesting suggestion. The discussion relates chiefly to churches in communities stationary or retrograding in population. But it applies largely, also, to any that are located outside cities and considerable towns. Rev. John Tunis urges, in the first article, a correct understanding of the people with whom one has to deal. Especially, he would have us distinguish between suburban villages and those which are unaffected by the currents of urban life. The minister is tempted to underrate the

people and their capacity to respond to his work. He should inquire, without much regard to denominational usages, what type of church-life is best suited to the needs of his flock. It is idle to expect each small locality to work out its problems and fight its battle, independently. The mission-station plan must come into the work. And "*hearing the Word*" will by no means suffice. Men get the larger share of what they know through the eyes. The writer commends texts illuminating the walls of the church, legends on the windows, frequent decorations at special services, and so on.

Also, he favors liturgical worship. The strain of continuous attention to a discourse, he argues, is too severe for undisciplined minds. A regular order of service, much of it responsive, relieves the tension. And the minister, as soon as possible after the service, as well as before it, should be at the church-door to take each worshiper by the hand. He would have the church interest itself in the formation of a village-improvement society, in observing Arbor-day, in establishing a reading-room, and like measures. He would occasionally select a week to be filled with religious services, with printed invitations circulated over a radius of about two miles. No service should go without a collection. He counts that an indispensable means of spiritual culture.

In addition to the Home Department of the Sunday-school, outlined in the last volume of *Current Discussions*, he would institute a "Home Department for Worship." He would pledge as many as possible of those unable to attend church, to set apart a certain hour on each Sabbath for Bible reading and perhaps the singing of hymns. The

writer, notwithstanding all the evils that have followed church-endowments, would have country-churches at least partially endowed. They are in the condition of a down-town city church, which finds all its congregation moving away. It must be supported by something more than the current gifts of the people.

The second article, in the October number of the *Review*, complains that about all we have done for the country church has been to borrow such inventions of the city as Young Men's Christian Associations, Societies for Christian Endeavor and the like. Not enough original thought and invention have been given to the country problem. It is a social as well as religious problem. As the home plays a much larger part in country than in city life, that fact must enter largely into the pastor's plans. Measures for cultivating home religion must be devised. Also the church must be the center for all manner of social refinement and of plans to promote it. This writer (Rev. C. M. Sheldon) would have the pastor the leader of the choir. To the week-day service he would give much care and labor. Send out a dozen or more postal cards to habitual absentees. Ask three or four to be prepared with lists of hymns to sing. The Sunday evening service he would make one of praise, with a liberal admixture of song. To the sermon he would prefix a discussion of recent public events in their religious aspects. Responsive reading of Scripture should come in. This writer, to become thoroughly acquainted with his people, obtained permission to board around with them, one week with a family at a time. Or rather, he took two meals each day, in this fashion, continuing it through one winter. Among other advan-

tages, as he claims, it gave him fine opportunity to make the acquaintance of the *men* of his congregation. In preaching, he recommends opening a subject in the morning, allowing the audience to reflect on it, and then concluding it at the second service. He would deal largely in illustration with object-lessons in the pulpit. In referring to a watch or flower or knife or whatever for illustration, he would have the article itself at hand, to be exhibited.

Our statistics show that the country-pastorate is commonly shorter than one in the city. The reason is found largely in lack of invention and enterprise in holding the congregation with an interest ever fresh. The country pastorate must be, to a great extent, a ministration to individuals. The people have a greater repugnance than the inhabitants of cities to organizations and constitutions. Only face-to-face work with individuals will win them. Much should be made, in the rural parish, of the "Church Wagon," or "Gospel Sleigh." Large vehicles should run from different parts of the town to the sanctuary, with free accommodation for all who are willing to attend. At any sacrifice the means for this must be secured.

Also, in a spirit of fraternal helpfulness, strong churches should send delegations, at times, to meet with and cheer weaker ones in their vicinity. And Christians dwelling between the two, should sever their connection with the former and join the latter. Let country and city pastors exchange—at the mid-week meeting, if not on the Sabbath. Lastly, an assistant should be employed, on a salary. His work should be to look after the poor, the sick, the lonely; but especially after outlying hamlets that are falling into incipient barbarism. No pastor alone can do a tithe of the work that must be done.

REV. DR. H. CLAY TRUMBULL'S YALE LECTURES ON THE
SUNDAY SCHOOL.¹

These lectures afford us perhaps the most complete treatise on the institution of which they treat that has yet appeared. The history of the Sunday School among the ancient Jews, the mediaeval and the modern churches; its membership, management, relations to the pastor and church; its auxiliary and training agencies, with two excellent chapters on preaching to children, are the rich and serviceable contents of the volume.

The earliest records of the Talmud indicate that Bible schools in connection with the synagogues, were in vogue at the opening of the Christian era.

That they existed far earlier is suggested by the fact that, though, in the pre-exilian period, the very word "school" is wanting in the language, shortly after that period, no less than eleven expressions of the idea of it occur. Instruction was always, not by continuous discourse, but, by the Socratic method of question and answer. Teaching among the Jews, meant not merely telling a thing, but causing another to know that thing.

Jesus always went about in all Galilee, "teaching in their synagogues," as well as "preaching."² This distinction between teaching (*didaskon*) and preaching (*kerusson*) is carefully preserved in the New Testament. And throughout the Middle Ages, wherever Christianity was purest,

¹ *The Sunday School, its Origin, Mission, Methods and Auxiliaries.* The Lyman Beecher Lectures before the Yale Divinity School for 1888. By H. Clay Trumbull Philadelphia: J. D. Wattles, Publisher.

² Matt., iv, 23.

among the Waldenses, Albigenses, Lollards, Wyclifites, Hussites and others, the Bible-school was sedulously maintained. Luther prepared a larger and a smaller catechism for a like service. Calvin, Zwingle, Beza, Knox, Ridley, Usher and others contributed to the good work. On the other hand, Ignatius Loyola, Lainez, Aquaviva and Xavier, with the Sunday School largely, stayed the progress of the Reformation, and fixed its boundaries where substantially they have remained to this day.. The Council of Trent, recognizing the peril of the Romish church, prepared a new catechism for children. St. Carlo Borromeo, after gathering a great school in the cathedral of Milan, left, at his death, in 1584, 743 such schools, with more than 3,000 teachers and 40,000 scholars.

The decline of the Sunday School among the Protestant churches, after the Reformation, seems to have been, at least partially, due to a mechanical recitation of the catechism, by rote, which dried out of it all freshness and life. "Words," said Dr. Watts, "are but as the husks of this Divine food, whereby the souls of the children must be nourished."

Among the fathers of New England, Church and State being united, Christian instruction was given in the common schools. Hence, when the common schools afterward became secularized, and there were no Sunday Schools, the religious training of the children was much neglected.

Dr. Trumbull ascribes to the Sunday School, far more largely than has been generally done, the great Christian awakening in England at the time of the Wesleys and Whitefield. Said Wesley, "It is one of the noblest insti-

tutions which has been seen in Europe for some centuries." Within four years after Robert Raikes commenced his work in Gloucester, there were a million and a quarter Sunday School scholars in Great Britain. Those schools were the beginning of the English common school system.

When the institution arose in this country, early in the present century, French infidelity and general godlessness were sweeping over the nation. It was, under God, the Sunday School, in great measure, that drove back the tide. We have, in our Protestant schools, to-day, from eight to ten million members—nearly as many as through the rest of the entire Protestant world.

About twenty-five years ago, Mr. Albert Woodruff, a Christian layman of Brooklyn, N. Y., started, in Germany, a Sunday School on the American plan. There are now, in that country, about 3,000 such schools, with 30,000 teachers and 300,000 scholars.

The International Lessons were formally inaugurated in 1873, and have since spread throughout Christendom. An immense Christian literature, of comment and illustration has been brought by them into existence. Said a prominent American pastor, recently, of a youth in his church, "He knows more of the Bible, now, when entering college, than I knew when leaving the theological seminary."

In reply to the complaint that the Sunday School militates against Christian instruction in the home, Dr. Trumbull argues that, universally, where the school thrives most vigorously, family-religion is at its best.

In England the children of the wealthier classes are not generally in the Sunday Schools. And evidence is ad-

duced, by our author, that they are lamentably wanting in Christian education. He shows also, from contemporary testimony, that the alleged high state of family religious instruction in New England, before the rise of the Sunday School, is mythical.

Dr. Trumbull insists that a church should both support and control its own Sunday School. Of a western church, which voted \$8,000 to its pastor, \$2,000 to its choir, and a pittance to its Sunday School, it was said that every scholar might well complain, "How many hired servants of my father have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger!"

The author recommends the formal installation of superintendent and teachers, as is, in many churches, already the custom.

In urging that children be trained to generous giving, he cites, from Dr. Titus Coan, the habit of the Sandwich Island mothers, in putting a small coin in the hand of a babe, holding the child over the contribution-box, and teaching it to drop in the money. Also, he refers to Mr. Henry P. Haven, of New London, Conn., who used to induce a large school to give to the poor, instead of receiving, Christmas gifts.

A difference exists between the English and American methods of the coöperation of Sunday Schools. The London Sunday School Union is a union of schools. The American Sunday School Union is a union of individuals, for promotion of interest in the work. The author defends the American way.

There is in the volume much good suggestion as to sermons for children. One method, in England, is to throw

upon an assistant minister this service, in the chapel, while the pastor has the adults in the main auditorium of the church. Dr. S. A. Tyng, Sr., invariably gave one of the two Sabbath services to the children. In many a sermon to adults the hearers may be left to infer the plan. But, with children, it must come out in clear outline. Too many stories often spoil a children's sermon. Many successful preachers to the little ones tell no stories whatever. But apt illustrations should abound. To find these, study the children themselves—their ways, habits, methods of conceiving of truth, etc. Very largely, a sermon to children should be question and answer. A telegraph-operator, who could get no *response*, would conclude that the connection was broken and that it was idle for him to proceed. The whole volume is a thesaurus of valuable matter.

TERMS OF CHRISTIAN UNION.

The discussion, by the last General Convention of the Episcopal Church, of the question of fellowship with other churches, the numerous interdenominational conferences for Christian consultation, the Church Union of Congregationalists and Presbyterians likely to be accomplished in Japan, and other causes, have accelerated the movement toward a closer affiliation of all evangelical believers. The "*Church Union*," a religious journal, in New York, is specially devoted to this aim. Impracticable as any organic federation—anything more than a harmony of spirit—would appear, there are not a few who look with confidence even for that. Conditions and platforms of principle and policy are freely discussed. Baptists and Pædo-Baptists are invited to meet on the common

ground of a public consecration of children, without the right of Baptism, to Christ. The terms of the Presbyterian and Congregational Union proposed in Japan are of interest as suggesting possibly similar methods elsewhere. In that Union each church is left, in its internal economy, absolutely free. It may elect a Presbyterian Session or a Congregational Prudential Committee, as shall seem good. For the fellowship of the churches, as in ordinations, installations and advice in difficult cases, stated conventions are held. These answer more nearly to a New England Conference, or a Western Association, than to either a Congregational Council or a Presbytery. These gatherings, called "bukwai," or "district meetings," exercise no ecclesiastical authority. A church which should persist in retaining a pastor pronounced by the "bukwai" unworthy, would simply, after the Congregational way, be dropped from the fellowship of the churches represented, and become independent. The "bukwai" holds regular semi-annual meetings. For installations, ordinations and like occasions, other sessions are called. There is also a general annual convention, like one of our State Associations, for reviewing the entire work of the churches and consulting for the common welfare. Two of these are to be held, representing two different sections of the Empire. A national biennial conference also enters into the plan proposed. Though a pastor may be a member of his own church, in case of charges against him he would be tried only by the "bukwai." There can be no successive appeals, as through Presbytery, Synod and General Assembly. An aggrieved brother in a church may appeal no further than to the "bukwai." The doctrinal

basis is broad enough to include evangelical Christians of every name. The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, with the creed of the Evangelical Alliance, are adopted as the only standards. But the Heidelberg and Westminster Catechisms, with the Plymouth Declaration, all have honorable mention. This catholic basis is in the line of a principle which is slowly but steadily gaining ground, that churches should include in their conditions of membership only the fundamental, saving truths and facts which are held in common by all believers. The practice is extending, at least among Congregationalists, of adopting a full dogmatic platform, which descends into detail, but, as a formula for the admission of new members, the Apostles' creed, or other brief and simple outline of the truths of our common Christianity.

This Japanese Union involves, as will be seen, large concessions from both denominations. It is not to be hoped that anything like it will be adopted in the United States. But every such demonstration of the feasibility of organic union sets the current of thought in that direction. It points toward the day when the churches shall be, like the early disciples, of one heart and one soul.

An article in *The Andover Review*, for March, 1888, by Mr. Jas. B. Wasson of New York, on the question, "Is Protestant Unity Possible?" deplores the multiplication of starveling churches of many sects, in small communities, and insists that the decadence of interest in the old, sectarian shibboleths is rapidly working toward organic union. No proposal from any one denomination will ever, in his opinion, be likely to attain the object. The plan of the Episcopal House of Bishops, that we should all accept

their view of church-orders, has been denounced as arrogant. In Mr. Wasson's view, it was simply a courteous statement of what they regard as fundamental to the very idea of a church. He looks for unity, not in the absorption by any one sect of all others, but in gradual assimilation, under the catholic spirit of the age, acting as a solvent on church barriers. This process, he believes (as the movement in Japan would seem to indicate) will first mature on missionary ground. There is in this suggestion plausibility, if not promise. The intensely practical character of missionary life, allowing little time or taste for theological hair-splitting, and the immense importance of the presentation by Christianity of a common front to a common foe, may easily put the mission churches in advance, as to this matter, of the churches at home.

An article in the same *Review*, for February, 1888, by Rev. W. F. Faber, of Westfield, N. Y., raises the question, "Why have a church?" He complains that, by the present conception of the church, it exists almost exclusively for worship. He finds each separate church held together only by the cohesion of common tastes and social ties. Without rebuke, almost without question, a Christian feels at liberty to select any church he chooses, however little needed he may be in it, however neglected he may leave febler churches that require his aid—as his fancy or accidental affiliations may incline him. Mr. Faber insists that the body of first disciples at Jerusalem was more than a religious society. Though it worshiped, it existed not for worship only. Though it evangelized, it existed not for evangelization alone. Nor was it merely for the upbuilding of its individual members in the divine

life. The temporary sharing by the rich of their means with the poor was no permanent community of goods. But it by no means follows, as we are too apt to suppose, that the Church was a mere religious association, touching life at but few points of contact. Its sphere was not that of religion, in the narrow sense only, but of the entire human life. It was the beginning of a newly-constituted Christian social order—a reorganized society on earth, in which not accidental tastes or affinities or conventionalities, but Christian love, was the main element and pervasive force. Toward the realization of this original type, as he contends, the modern Church, if she is ever to realize essential union, must continually strive. If we call this visionary and impracticable, so too we may pronounce the prayer, “Thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth.” “Because,” he says, “the church limits herself to a small fraction of man’s time and interests, devoting herself to what she is pleased to call, with the most indefinite of words, ‘religion,’ and because she does not believe that, in such an age as this, God can give her power over the manifold secular and social activities of men, therefore she has it not.”

To the same periodical, for January, 1888, Prof. E. P. Gould of Burlington, Vt., contributes a suggestive article on “The True Church.” He starts with the premise that in the apostolic era, Christian faith was an acceptance of Christ as a personal Redeemer, rather than of any system of doctrines regarding Him. This faith in Him, as in Paul’s words to the jailor, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved,” was personal, simple, initial, and, with the accompanying confession, was the

only condition of entrance into the church. This is the constitutive act—the constructive principle, of the church. Consequently, while the modern denominations are content with a general harmony of Christian sentiment or feeling, but despair of organic union, this simple faith made the apostolic Church organically one. All believers constituted one body. The conflict over the Judaizing tendency was as radical and divisive as anything in the history of Christianity. But Paul never thought of dividing the church on the question. And both parties were harmonized by the Jerusalem council. The objection to this writer's view, on the ground that belief in Christ is belief in the truth about Him, and is therefore more or less doctrinal in its character, he meets with the assertion that while the Church should defend all doctrinal truth, this is the work of the whole Church, not of factions, or churches, antagonizing one another. The very spirit needed for such defense is, as things now stand, impossible. A church which has it for its very idea to defend certain opinions, is in no condition to discover the truth. And if the Church is recognized, not as a multitude of different bodies, gathered about their various watch-words, but as the beginning of a heavenly society on earth, divisive opinions would carry their cleavage to no such depth as now. Prof. Gould strenuously urges Christian comity among Home Missionary societies. He proposes to each society, as a test-question, before aiding a new church, "Should we grant this aid if *eno gh* churches *of our own sect* were already planted in that community?" These discussions all suggest the query whether there may not have been a profounder wisdom in the dictum of Dr. Leonard Bacon, that

we "Congregationalists are not a denomination," than has been generally recognized. Concede it, as a necessary evil, that we must for the present conduct our work *as if we were* a denomination. But this need not discredit the principle that ideally, and in aim, we belong only to the Church universal.

CHRISTIAN BENEFICENCE.

"The next great problem," said Dr. Horace Bushnell, "is the consecration of wealth." For two momentous reasons, in this country, at least, that is true. The first is, that the love of money is peculiarly the American sin. Europeans are sufficiently imbued with it. But, with them, other evils, not less serious, act as a counterpoise to this. Society is more rigidly stratified than with us. Wealth flows less readily from hand to hand. Laws of entail secure it to some, almost forbid it to others. To the peerage, wealth, as being largely a matter of course, is, as a social factor, comparatively weak. To the working class it is mainly beyond reach.

Other evils and perils are more prominent and permanent than the love of money. But, among us, wealth is free to whoever has the energy and tact to win it. The golden prize glitters in the vision of every day-laborer at his task. Worldliness, selfishness, take naturally therefore the one shape of mammon-worship. And, if this vice is ever to be remedied, the antidote must begin in the churches. Till men discover in Christ's disciples, something of the cross-bearing spirit that overcomes this love of lucre, it is vain to commend that spirit to the world.

without. But, for a second reason, the consecration of wealth is of utmost moment in the United States. These States have an immense and always increasing capital. According to Mr. Edward Atkinson,¹ the latest estimate of our accumulations is about \$60,000,000,000, and the yearly increase \$900,000,000, or nearly \$3,000,000 daily. As the wealthiest nation in the world, as more able, therefore, than any other, to contribute for the world's redemption, we are falling, every year, under heavier obligations. Our periodical Christian literature, of late, urges various methods of meeting this responsibility. The tithing system is, in some quarters, strenuously commended. If the individual conscience and judgment of the donor commend it, well. But the notion, so confidently urged, that the tithe, of the patriarchal and Mosaic Economies, is binding, as a law, upon us to-day, rests on false interpretation of Scripture. No good cause was ever permanently aided by perversion of the Word of God. No recognition of the tithe system, as binding on Christians, occurs in the New Testament. But personal obligation, in view of fuller light and ability is far greater in the New Economy than in the Old.

THE WEEKLY OFFERING.

The serious bearing of the free-seat system, as commonly conducted, on the beneficence of the churches, is beginning to attract attention. The income for current expenses, where this system is in vogue, is obtained by the weekly envelope plan. The envelopes, with any con-

¹ *Men of Wealth and Institutions of Learning, in New Englander and Yale Review.* June, 1888, p. 403.

tributions for the purpose, not so enclosed, are collected in the plates or boxes. Any offering for missions, or other charity, outside the church, comes in, therefore, at great disadvantage. If two collections are taken, the same day, the amount for the charitable object will be small. If, on certain Sabbaths, the charity is allowed the whole field, the temptation is strong to bring in such occasions as rarely as possible. The trustees complain of the effect on current expenses. *The Congregationalist*, August, 1888, mentions two churches, as nearly equal in ability as they well could be, one of which gave, in charities, five times as much as the other. The reason was that the former, meeting its expenses by pew-rents, gave its collections to charities. The latter, with the free-seat system, gave its collections to its own trustees. This evil is far more extensive and serious than is generally supposed. The remedy, if free seats are to be maintained, is obvious. The current expenses must be met by definite subscriptions, made and paid *outside the church walls*, and on secular days of the week. Otherwise we shall be inviting in the "home heathen," at our own doors, at the heavy cost of heathen beyond the seas.

FREE SEATS IN CHURCHES.

In *The Forum*, for June, 1888, Rev. Dr. A. F. Pierson has, under the title, "Should the Churches be Free?" a vigorous protest against pew-rents. Some of his premises refute one another. *E. g.* "It would be hard to find in the preaching and practice of the primitive church, any authority or precedent for modern pew-rents." On the following page he informs us that "For hundreds of

years there appear to have been no paid preachers or teachers, singers or choirs, nor even hired keepers of the house of prayer. . . . Those who labored in the Gospel worked without charge, some upon principle, taking nothing of the Gentiles, others working with their own hands, lest they should burden the feeble church." Manifestly if there were no expenses, there was no occasion for pew-rents or any other source of income. Any argument drawn from such a situation is, for our time, of no value.

The next consideration, urged by Dr. Pierson, is of hardly greater weight. "A church," he says, "in which individuals cannot have the control of the pews, cannot be free to all the uses of religion; and trustees, who invite into it popular assemblies, between Sabbaths, incur censure." This may, in some instances, be true. But we have churches in abundance, with rented pews, where the trustees feel as free as those of any other church, to admit any proper assembly. If it is not universally understood, it should be, that the rental of a pew entitles the occupant to it only on the Sabbath. On other days he has no more right in it than any one else.

Again, Dr. Pierson argues that, "while dependence is placed upon pew-rents for revenues, it must be an object to court the highest bidder; and hence the applicant will be rated chiefly at his money-value." If this be true, it will be true in whatever way he pays for the support of worship. And if current expenses are to be met, pay he must, in some sort of ratio with his means.

Dr. Pierson claims that the pew-rent system brings the pulpit under bondage. "It takes," he says, "a brave

soul to hurl his bolts against intemperance and adultery, when he is expected to please those who sell liquid damnation and trample on the Seventh Commandment." If the offender were a heavy subscriber to the pastor's salary, and the pews were free, the same courage would be demanded. The only remedy is one which Dr. Pierson urges, viz.: that the church proper, without calling on the congregation at large, should bear the whole expense of the worship. Undoubtedly that is the ideal way. But there are churches by the thousand, where it is an absolutely impossible way. The chief wealth of many a congregation is held outside the professed disciples of Christ in it. The church alone is simply unable to support the preaching of the Gospel. Should such a church not meet for worship? Or should it worship without preaching or other expense?

But notwithstanding these objections to the reasoning of Dr. Pierson, the free-seat system, with the expenses borne by Christian disciples alone, and through subscriptions paid on secular days and outside church-walls, is the policy at which we should steadily aim. If aid in support of the church must be received from non-church members, it should be with the explicit understanding that they are not to control either church or pastor. And the instances in which they would care to do either would be exceedingly rare. They are not heathen, like those from whom the early churches declined to receive aid. They are often deeply interested in the welfare of the church, loyal to the pastor, and, some of them, genuine disciples of Christ.

It is urged, in favor of free seats, by a writer in *The*

Christian Union, for August, 1888, that they promote punctuality in attendance at church. That the families of the congregation may enjoy the same seats from Sabbath to Sabbath, the seats are *assigned* to them. But, in one church mentioned, their exclusive right to them ceases at the commencement of the service. After that, the pews are free to all comers. The result is said to be a great improvement in punctuality of attendance.

DEACONNESSES IN EUROPE.

Mrs. C. M. Mead gathered into an article in *The Andover Review*, for June, 1888, a mass of information as to this class of noble Christian laborers. In the largely increasing numbers of our own devout and earnest countrywomen, the question may arise whether, on a greater scale than any hitherto known, some such beneficent body should not be organized among us.

Founded by Pastor Theodor Fliedner, at Kaiserswerth on the Rhine, in May, 1836, the Rhenish Westphalian Deaconess Society had, in 1887, 580 deaconesses and 196 probationers, working at more than 200 stations. The number of deaconess' houses, similar to that at Kaiserswerth, for their residence and training, is at present 89. The work is under the supervision of a board of directors, of which the presidents and vice-presidents of the provincial synods of the Rhineland and Westphalia are *ex-officio* members.

The deaconesses labor for the physical and spiritual good of sufferers of all religions without discrimination. They must not, however, proselyte to Protestantism those of other faiths. None but unmarried women and childless

widows, of Protestant churches, and from 18 to 40 years of age are admitted. No vow of any sort is taken. The deaconess engages for only five years. After that period she is free to continue or not. Even meanwhile she may marry, or return home to the care of dependent parents. The Scriptures are constantly studied, and sacred song fills a large share in the routine of the day. There is a country house, to which the sisters may go for recruiting, as also a "House of Evening Rest," so called, for those unable, through infirmities or age, to continue their labors.

The Marthashof, in Berlin, founded by Fliedner, is an asylum for servant girls out of employ. In 1849, he established on this side of the water, at Pittsburg, Penn., a branch deaconess house which, at Rochester, N. Y., is still maintained. In Italy, at Rome and Florence, even in Jerusalem and Smyrna and Beirut, these indefatigable philanthropists are at work. Similar, but independent, institutions have arisen in almost every country of Europe. Florence Nightingale stimulated the increase of them in England. There is not in Christendom a nobler example of our religion in its practical working than that of these earnest and self-sacrificing women.

SHALL WOMEN PREACH?

An interesting discussion of this question, between Miss Frances Willard, President of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and Rev. Dr. H. Z. Van Dyke of Brooklyn, has been carried on in *The Homiletic Review*, for 1888. untenable positions have been taken and arguments used, as it appears to us, on both sides. Miss Willard seems to assume that there is, as to this matter, no

appreciable difference between the sexes. She apparently sees no reason that women should not, as commonly as men, enter on the pastorate. That wifehood and motherhood are, as the general rule, the divinely ordered estate of woman, seems quite foreign to her reckoning. The conjugal and maternal relations are sacred and abiding facts. They are not to be set aside by any novel theories about the expanding sphere of woman. And it is obvious that, except in very extraordinary cases, wifehood and motherhood are incompatible with the pastoral office. Miss Willard denounces the celibacy of the Romish priesthood. But it seems not to occur to her that she is, in effect, urging a clerical celibacy of her own sex. And her argument is by no means strengthened by the prophetic warnings, thrown in for the admonition, not to say intimidation, of opponents of her views.

But Dr. Van Dyke has more unwarrantable assertions than Miss Willard. In his first proposition that women have no special qualifications for the pulpit, he insists that they are not morally better, by nature, than men. The fact that they furnish, universally, two-thirds of the membership of the churches of Christ and not a fifth of our convicts, makes no appearance in his reasoning.

The fact, which he adduces, that our Lord chose no women among the apostles and that women are nowhere in Scripture authorized to preach, will carry no great weight till he shows that they are positively forbidden to do so. This he attempts to do, and so to foreclose for Christian readers the whole discussion, by quoting Paul's prohibition to women to speak in public. In so doing, he resorts, we believe, to radically unsound principles of

interpretation. The only instances in which these prohibitions occur are in I Cor. xiv, 34, 35 and I Tim. ii, 11, 14. Now Corinth was in Greece. Timothy was laboring in Ephesus and other cities adjacent, some of them Grecian colonies, just across the Ægean sea. The prohibitions, therefore, were to take effect in communities dominated by the Hellenic civilization and social usages.

The question then arises, Was there anything in the social condition of woman in those communities, which would specially require such prohibitions? There are many evidences that, in the Homeric, or heroic, age, women were highly regarded. But in the later, historic times they were counted as in every sense inferior.¹ Their education was almost entirely neglected. They were thought incompetent for an intelligent sympathy with their male relatives. The only virtues of which they were esteemed capable were those of a faithful slave. Except in a woman's own home circle, her existence, even, was hardly recognized. In the house she was chiefly confined to the gynaeconitis, or women's apartments, in the rear; while the apartments for men were in front. A law of Syracuse, a Grecian colony, forbade a free woman to be seen out-of-doors after sunset. No wife could eat, if strangers were present, with her husband. Even when the disastrous battle of Cheronea threw Athens into a fever of excitement, no woman ventured beyond her own door-step, to inquire the news.

The only class of women who did appear in public,

¹ Cf. Becker's *Charikles*. Trans. by Rev. T. Metcalf, p. 462, *et seq.*; *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 22, p. 163; *The Contemporary Review*, Vols. 32 and 33.

attend the schools of philosophers, and debate with citizens, were the *hetairai*, or courtesans. To increase their attractiveness, they cultivated rhetoric, wit and humor, and often distinguished themselves intellectually.

Evidently enough, in such communities, with such social usages, had a Christian woman appeared in assemblies and taken audible part in them, the heathen Greeks would have at once suspected and thrown suspicion upon her. More harm than good would have resulted. Not to carry the discussion farther, it is, in our view, clear that the prohibition, like the direction in I Cor. xi, 10, that a woman should have, always, a veil on the head, was local and transient. To infer from the condition and privileges of women, in a heathen community, in the first century, to that of our Christian countrywomen in the nineteenth, is a patent non-sequitur. It is in the same line with the defense set up for slavery, before the civil war, on the ground that Paul nowhere forbids it. There are reasons enough against the general assumption of the pastorate by women, without relying on false interpretation of Scripture. If, in a rare instance, a Congregational church, like that at Nantucket, Mass., elects to be served by an able and most estimable lady as pastor, it would be hard to prove that it is under the frown of the Great Head of the Church for disobedience to his Word. The whole question is one to be solved not by ethics or exegesis, but on broad grounds of Christian expediency. And these grounds are likely, for a long period to come, to admit women to the pastorate only in exceptional instances.

I N D E X.

- ABBEY, on Church of 18th cent., 270
Abbott, Lyman, 119, 120, 136, 439
Accents, Hebrew, 7, 8
Acts, The, 84, 112
Adrian, Introduction, 79
Albrecht, 7
Allard, on Persecutions, 163, 164
Allen, 206, 274
Agapē, The, 162
Amélineau, on Gnosticism, 169, on Monasticism, 193
America, Hebrew Study in, 3
Anabaptists, The, 233
Angus, 141
Ankel, on Geog. of Palest., 48
Antiqua Mater, 149
Apocalypse, The, 92, 96, 126, 130, 131, 144
Apologetics, by Martineau, 311, Ebrard, 320
Archæology, Biblical, 52 Christian, 199
Armitage, 157
Arnold, 160, 161, 162
Athanasius, Life of, 193
Atkinson, E., on American Wealth, 458
Atonement, Views of, 260, 292, 296, 298, by Burney, 336, by Cochran, 338, Eternal, Hitchcock, 414
Art, in Early Church, 199
BACKHOUSE, 206
Baird, on Huguenots, 247
Baldensperger, 132, 133
Batiffol, 95
Baumgartner, 6
Beecher, Prof., 18
Bellarmine, Autobiography of, 252
Bellesheim, Hist. of Cath. Church of Scotland, 213
Beneficence, Christian, 457
Bennett, on Christ. Art, 199
Berchtold, on Bull Unam Sanctam, 209
Bethge, 112
Bevan, 219
Bible, Latin, 96
Bibliotheca Sacra, 239
Bickell, 198
Bissell, on Codes, 17, 53
Boardman, G. D., 100
Böhl, Dogmatik, 284
Bois, 24
Boise, 126, 127
Bradford, A. H., 427
Bratke, 196, 198
Bredenkamp, on Isaiah, 70
Briggs, 9, 92, 107
Broadus, 103
Bruce, 91, on Humil. of Christ, 331
Brück, Hist. of Cath. Church in Germany, 253
Buddhism, 306
Burger, 90, 128
Burney, on Atonement, 336
Burton, N. J., on Preaching, 398
CAIRNS, on Church of Holland, 249
Carr, on Rhodes, 157, 225
Chadwick, 108
Chambers, 16
Cheyne, on Criticism, 41, on Deuteronomy, 44, 45, on the Pss., 66, 67
Christ and the Fathers, 150
Christian Church, Hist. of, 151 History, Institutes of, 151 Union, 451

- Christian Worship, 196
 Christianity, Attacks on, 165
 Beginnings of, 158
 Original, by Pfleiderer, 154
 Principles of, 295
 in United States, 273
 Christology, in Early Church, 180
 Chokma Literature, 24
 Church, The, 454, 455
 Country, Problem of, 443
 Early and Empire, 157
 Early, Organization of, 183
 The English and its Bishops, 271
 Churches, Free Seats in, 459
 Church History, Division of, 153
 Manual of, 151
 Study of, 150
 Church Kingdom, The, 183, 347
 Church, Roman Catholic, 252, in
 Germany, 253
 Church and State, 354
 Church of Sub. Apost. Age, 188
 Churches, The and Working-
 men, 439
 Cities, Modern and their Relig.
 Problems, 412
 Clement of Alex., and Mysteries, 196
 Clergymen, Legal Rights of, 441
 Clubs, Funeral, 160, 164
 Codex, The Leicester, 94
 Colossians, Epistle to, 125
 Comba, 220
 Conder, 53
 Corinthians, Epistles to, 114
 Correspondence bet. Martensen
 and Dorner, 257
 Councils, Hist. of, 210
 Cox, S., 422
 Coxe, 151
 Creation, 59
 Creighton, on Wolsey, 244
 Criticism, Hallowing of, Cheyne,
 41.
 Textual, 10, 11
 Views of, 43, 44, 281
 Crosberry, 83
 Cross, The Victory of, 429
 DALAND, 26, 27
 David of Thessalonica, Life of,
 173
 Davids, T. W. R., on Buddhism,
 306
 Dawson, 51
 Deaconesses, in Europe, 462
 Deane, 41
 Death, Salvation after, Morris,
 344
 Deland, M., 407
 Delitzsch, on Genesis, 15, 43, 58,
 59, 60, 63, 64, on the Pss., 68, 70
 De Rossi, on Baptism, 197
 Deutero-Isaiah, 71
 Deuteronomy, 20, 21, 22, 23
 De Waal, on Apocr. Gospels in
 Art, 203
 Dillman, 58, 69
 Discussions, Theological, in Ger-
 many, 257
 Doctrine, Hist. of, 166, 173, 217
 Döllinger and Reuseh on Bellar-
 mine, 252
 Döring, M., 211
 Dogmatik, by Böhl, 284
 Dorchester, on Christ. in United
 States, 273
 Dorner, 257, 263
 Driver, on Isaiah, 43, 57
 Dummer, on Luther Prints, 238
 Dwinell, 19
 EBRARD, on Apologetics, 320
 Edwards, C. E., 114, 116, 117
 Ehrle, on Minorites, 222, Coun-
 cil of Vienne, and Spirituals,
 223
 Eicken, 206
 Elijah, Life of, 41
 Ellicott, 86, 114, 116, 117, 118
 Encyclopaedia of Living Divines,
 276
 Ephesians, Epistle to, 87
 Epistles, Catholic, 89, 126
 Pastoral, 126
 Eschatology, 141, 344
 Essays, on Pentateuch, 16
 Essenes, The, 149, 192
 Ethics, 351
 Euting, 68

- Evangelistic Work, 409
 Evolution, Doctrine of, 280
 Expositions, Cox, 422
 Expositor, The, 81, 102, 113, 141,
 187
- FABER, W. F., on the Church,
 454
- Fairbairn, R. B., on Morality, 355
- Faith of the Gospel, Mason, 331
- Farrer, 102, 305
- Fetzer on Pope Alex. II., 208
- Fisher, G. P., 151
- Forbes, on the Psalms, 61, 65
- Forum, The, 459
- Franz, 201
- Fraser, D., on Skepticism, 395
- Fraticelli, The, 224
- Fricke, 136
- Friedenburg, on Diet of Speier,
 238
- Friedrich, 54
- GALATIANS, Epistle to, 96
- Gardiner, 16
- Gebhardt, 211
- Geikie, 51, 97
- Gelzer, 207
- Genesis, 15, Commentary on, 57,
 59, 60
- Geography of Palestine, Ankel,
 46
- Germano, 204
- Gesenius, Grammar of, 6
- Gess, on Visitation of Monas-
 teries, 236
- Gloel, on H. Spirit in Paul. Writ-
 ings, 139
- Gnostics, The, 168, 169
- Godet, 86, 87, 91, 92, 114, 116,
 118, 120
- Göbel, 86, 113, 114, 116, 118, 119
- Görres, 165, 166.
- Gössling, 79
- Gospels, Apocryphal, 101
- Gould, E. P., on Church, 455
- Grammar, Hebrew, 6, 7
- Grau, 132, 133
- Great Britain, Churches of, 269
- Green, H. Grammar of, 6, on
 Exodus, 17
- Gregory, 95, 96
- Grimm, Joseph, 100
- Grube, 211
- HALE, E. E., 373
- Häring, on Ritschl's Theology,
 266, 295
- Harmon, 19
- Harnack, 167, Hist. of Doctrine,
 173
- Harper, on Heb. Syntax, 6
- Harris, J. R., 94
- Hasenclever, 200, 201
- Hauck, 167, 207
- Hebrew, Study of in America, 3,
 Syntax, 6
- Hebrews, Epistle to, 126, 129
- Hebrews, History of, 39
- Hegel, 352, 353, 354, 355, 359
- Heinrici, 189, 201
- Hemphill, 20
- Hergenröther, Hist. of Councils,
 210
- Hermann, Theology of, 268
- Heron, 188
- Hilgenfeld, on Pfleiderer, 156, on
 Essenes, 192
- Hill, A. S., 370
- Historical Books of Old Test., 18
- History of Israel, 30, 35, 37
- New Testament, 97
- Hitchcock, R. D., 414
- Hohoff, on Reformation a Revolu-
 tion, 234
- Holiness, in N. Test., 140
- Holland, Struggle in Church of,
 249
- Holtzmann, Oscar, 83
- Hood, E. P., on Preacher, 404
- Horst, 21
- Horton, on Inspiration, 329
- Huguenots, The, 247
- Hull, W., on Rights of Clergy,
 441
- Humiliation of Christ, Bruce, 331
- Hupfeld, 69
- Hutchinson, 124
- Hyvernat, 171
- INFALLIBILITY, in R. Cath. His-
 tory, 235

- Inquisition, The, 220
 Inspiration, 327, by Manly, 328,
 by Horton, 329
 Introduction, N. Test., 79
 O. Test., 13
 Isaiah, 70,
 Book of, 32,
 Life of, Driver, 43
 Israel, History of, 30
 Issel, on Holiness in N. Test., 140
- JACKSON, S. M., Encyclopaedia,
 276
- Jennings, Manual of Ch. Hist.,
 151
- Jeremiah, Life of, Cheyne, 44
 Jeremias, 73, 75
 Jesus, Life of, 100, 101
 Self-consciousness of, 132
 Job, Book of, 27, 28
 John, Gospel of, 83, 109
- KEIL, 52
- King, C. W., 165, on Gnostics, 168
- Kirsch, 202
- Kittel, 21, 39
- Knoke, 126
- Kölling, 126
- Köstlin, on Christ. Worship, 199
- Kohlschmidt, on School of
 Ritschl, 268
- Kommentar, Kurzgefasster, 87,
 89, 90, 91, 93, 126, 128, 131
- Krüger, on School of Ritschl, 265
- Kübel, 87, 91, 92, 93
- Kurtz, Church Hist., 152
- LACTANTIUS, Dualism of, 172
- Ladd, 81
- Lagarde, 11
- Land, The Holy, 97
- Last Things, Five, 141
- Lectures, Yale, on Preaching, 398
- Lemonnier, 158
- Leontius of Byzantium, 173
- Leo XIII., Life of, 253
- Ley, 8
- Liell, on Virgin Mary in Art, 201
- Life, Christian, 191
- Lipsius, 170, 266
- Loman, 150
- Loomis, S. L., on Modern Cities,
 412
- Loos, 172
- Luthardt, 91
- Luther, F., on Theology of
 Ritschl, 263
- MACLAREN, 125
- Man, The Divine, 100
- Manchot, 130, 185
- Manly, on Inspiration, 328
- Manoury, 193
- Marcion, 170
- Marignan, 204
- Mark, Commentaries on, 108
- Martens, 172
- Martensen, 257
- Martin, 13
- Martineau, on Religion, 311
- Martyrs, Cath. in England, 245
- Mason, The Faith of the Gospel,
 331
- Matthew, Commentaries on, 103
- McCosh, J., 419
- Mead, C. M., on Deaconesses,
 462
- Meyboom, on Marcion, 170
- Meyer, W., on Free Will, 351
- Modern Cities and their Relig.
 Problems, 412
- Molinier, on the Inquisition, 220
- Monasticism, Rise of, 191
- Monod, on Mediaeval Morals,
 226
- Montet, 220
- Moore, 3
- Morals, in Eighth Century, 226
- Moral System and Atonement,
 Cochran, 338
- Morris, on Hegel, 352, 355
- Morris, on Salv. after Death, 344
- Miller, 102
- Milligan, 41, 187
- Mulford, 353
- Müller, K., 207, 220, 222, on pre-
 Reformation Research, 227
- Murray, J. O., 375
- NIPPOLD, 234
- Nösken, on Theology of Ritschl,
 268

- Nowack, 69
 OHLE, 191
 Orders, Monastic, 221
 Organization of Early Church, 183
 Ormiston, 376, 377, 381
 O'Reilly, Life of Leo XIII., 253
 Osgood, 20
- PALESTINE, Geography of, Ankel, 46, 97
 Papacy, Hist. of, 206
 Parousia, The, 134, 142
 Paul, Letters of, 86, 126,
 Speeches of, 112
 Paul, Ludwig, 82
 Pentateuch, The, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20
 Persecutions, in Persia, 166,
 Under Trajan, 160
 Peshitto, The, 12
 Peter, Epistles of, 128
 Pfeiderer, on Luther as Moral-
 ist, 239
 Pfeiderer, Prof. O., on Original
 Christianity, 154, 155, 156
 Philemon, Epistle to, 125
 Philippi, on Anabaptists, 233
 Philippians, Epistle to, 124
 Philosophy and Religion, 357
 Pick, 101, 149
 Pierson, A. T., 409, 459
 Pinnock, 46
 Plitt, on Symbolics, 269
 Plummer, 157
 Poetry, Hebrew, 8, 24, 25
 Pohl, 201
 Pont, 23, 24
 Prayer, according to Paul, 138
 Preacher, John Ward, 407
 Preacher, Vocation of, 404
 Preger, 220
 Porter, N., 416
 Pressensé, 152
 Primer, of N. Test. Greek, 102
 Principles of Christianity, Stu-
 art, 295
 Probation, Views on, 282
 Protestantism in Spain, 241
 Protestants, French, in Magde-
 burg, 248
- Proverbs, Book of, 25, 26
 Psalms, 19, 20, 23, Metre of, 8, 9,
 61
 Pulpit, English in, 370
 German, 363
 Scottish, 366
 Story Telling in, 372
 And Modern Skepticism, 387
 Training for, 377
- QUARTERLY, The Lutheran, 149,
 239
- REFORMATION, The, 234
 Reformers, Spanish, Works of,
 243
 Rainsford, W. S., Sermons of,
 423
 Religion, of Babylonians, 73
 Non-Biblical Systems of, 305
 A Study of, Martineau, 311
 Renan, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39
 Resurrection, 75
 Reuseh and Döllinger on Bellar-
 mine, 252
 Revel, 14
 Review, Andover, 136, 443, 445,
 453, 454, 455, 462
 The Homiletic, 305, 363, 365,
 373, 375, 381, 383, 387, 439,
 441, 463
 The Presbyterian, 107, 247,
 249, 263
 The Unitarian, 206, 274, 275, 276
 The Yale, 458
 Reynolds, 83, 109
 Ribbeck, on Seneca, 152
 Riee, 103
 Richard, on Lord's Supper, 239
 Rigg, 184
 Ritschl, 154, 155, 228, 263, 265,
 266, 268
 Robins, 53
 Robinson, E. G., on Skepticism,
 388
 Romans, Epistle to, 119
 Roos, on Paul's Letters, 138
 Rose, 173
 Ross, A. H., 183, 347, 425
 Russell, on the Parousia, 142
 Ryssel, 71

- SAMUEL, Life of, 40
 Sayee, 46, 73, 75
 Schaff, 272, 276
 Schegg, 52
 Schmid, Hist. of Doctrine, 166
 Schmidt, H., on Ritschl's Theology, 265
 Schnedermann, 87
 Schodde, 17
 Schwabe, on Berengar, 218
 Schottmüller, on Templars, 225
 Schultze, on Eccles. Archaeol. Research, 200
 Scotland, Hist. of Cath. Church of, 213
 Seboek, 12
 Seeberg, 217
 Seneca, 152
 Septuagint, The, 11
 Sermons for Children, Ross, 425
 Gospel, 419
 preached in St. George's, 423
 Servant of Jehovah, 33
 Segerlen, on Early Episcopate, 189
 Shedd, on System. Theology, 287
 Sheldon, C. M., 445
 Sheol, 73, 74
 Simon Magus, 168
 Simon, on Dorner, 263
 Skepticism, Modern and the pulpit, 387
 Slierer, 150
 Sohm, Outlines of Ch. Hist., 151
 Sommiers, 135
 Song of Songs, 26, 27, 28, 29
 Soteriology, by Burney, 336
 Speier, Diet of, 238
 Spencer, on Last Things, 141
 Spillman, on Cath. martyrs in England, 245
 Spirit and Life, 427
 Spirit, the Holy, in Paul's writings, 139
 Spirituals, The, 223
 Spurrell, 57
 Stade, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36
 Stapfer, 97, 98
 Steimnayer, 109
 Stickel, 26, 27
 Stokes, 198, 203, on Oxford movement, 269
 Story telling, in pulpit, 372
 Streibert, 19
 Strong, 357
 Stuart, on Christianity, 295
 Stuckenbergh, on Philosophy, 358, on preaching, 363
 Sully, 54
 Sunday Schools, Trumbull on, 447
 Swete, 11
 Symbolies, by Plitt, 269
 Synods, French of the Desert, 247
 Synoptists, the, 81
 Syntax, Hebrew, Elements of, 6
 TALMUD, The, 98, 99
 Taylor, W. M., on Scott Pulpit, 366
 Temple, of Ezekiel, 53, 54
 Herod, 53
 Solomon, 53
 Temptation, of Christ, 104
 Text, Massoretic, 8, 12
 N. Test., 94
 Theologische Literaturzeitung, 11, 220
 Theology, Dogmatic, Shedd, 287
 of N. Test., 132
 of Old Testament, 72
 of Paul, 136
 Rational, J. M. Williams, 307
 of Ritschl, 260, 263, 265, 266, 268, 295
 Treatises on, 284
 Thessalonians, Epistles to, 113, 144
 Thomas, J., on Skepticism, 392
 Three Friends of God, 219
 Timothy, Epistles to, 126
 Tollin, on Huguenots, 248
 Tongues, Gift of, 117
 Trumbull, H. C., on Sunday Schools, 447
 Trümpert, on Justification, 136, 137
 Tunis, J., 443
 Tyler, 206

- UNION, Christian, 451
United States, Church and State in, 272
Usteri, J. M., 90, 128
- VAN DYKE, H. E., on Women preaching, 463
- Vocation, of the Preacher, 104
- Volkmar, 85
- Volz, 158
- WAHLE, 83, 109
- Warburton, 75
- Wasson, J. B., on Prot. Unity, 453
- Wealth, men of, 458
- Weber, 13
- Weingarten, 159, 166, 171, 186, 209, 222
- Wellhausen, 36
- West, N., 387
- Westcott, B. F., 429
- Wickes, on Hebrew accents, 7, 8
- Wilkens on Spanish Protestantism, 241
- Wilkinson, 378, 380
- Willard, F., 383, 463
- Williams, J. M., 307
- Witnesses for Christ, 206
- Workingmen and Churches, 439
- Wolff, 153
- Wolsey, Cardinal, 244
- Women, shall they preach ? 383, 463
- Woolf, 55
- World, Ancient and Christianity, 152
- World, the, to come, 433
- Wright, W. B., 433
- YALE COLLEGE, Fifteen Years in Chapel of, 416
- Yale Lectures, on Preaching, 398
- Yriarti, on Caesar Borgia, 212
- ZAHN, on Ritsehl, 265
- Ziegler, on Christ. Belief, 309
- Zimmer, 96, 119
- Zimmern, 138
- Zöckler, 165



1 1012 01245 1615

DATE DUE

